DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 407 UD 016 664

TITLE 1975 Annual Report to the President and the Congress. [National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children].
INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 160p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; Delinquents; Early Childhood; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Handicapped Children; Mathematics; Migrant Education; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Programs; Staff Utilization; *State of the Art Reviews; Success Factors; Urban Education; Vocational Development
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

The report makes recommendations in the following areas: school finance, urban education, handicapped education, nonpublic schools, parents' rights, staff development, early childhood, career education, bilingual education, migrant education, and education for the neglected and delinquent. The document contains a review of pertinent legislation and brief summaries of exemplary Title I programs in urban and rural school districts. It includes various ethnic groups, cites the kinds of problems students are encountering in various geographic areas and reviews the programs which are being attempted in these areas. All reading and mathematics programs described have accomplished a month-per-month gain in students' achievements. Programs serving the children in state and local institutions reflect the recidivism rate for those students which had been reduced by one-half when they entered the program. The major categories of information studied are: (1) area of concentration, (2) goals of the programs, (3) gains made in student achievements, (4) statistics on student participation, and (5) curriculum employed. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133407

1975 ANNUAL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON THE EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN**
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 1012
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 382-6945

UD016664

Table of Contents

Page

Letter of Transmittal iii

Overview 1

Summary of Council's Recommendations and Positions 3

Legislation 11

  Analysis of Current Legislative Actions Affecting Council's Concerns 12
  School Finance 29
  Urban Education 33

Staff Development. 35

Early Childhood Education 43

Career Education 49

Bilingual Education 53

Migrant Education 59

Services to Neglected and Delinquent Children 67

Title I, ESEA Mandated Studies 75

Successful Projects 79

Appendices 105

  A. Institutions Offering Specialized Training to Teachers of the Disadvantaged Child 107
  B. State Legislation for Education of the Handicapped 116
  C. Court Cases (Bilingual) 121
  D. State-by-State Survey of Bilingual Education 126
  E. Fiscal Year 1975 Allocations for State Programs for Migratory Children 131
  F. Number and Rate of Delinquency Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, 1957-72 133
  G. Number and Rate of Dependency and Neglect Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, 1972 135
  H. Fiscal Year 1974 and 1975 Formula Children for Local Educational Agencies 137
  I. Fiscal Year 1974 and 1975 Formula Children for State Educational Agencies 140
  J. Title I, ESEA Allotments for Fiscal Year 1975 142
  K. Title I, ESEA Allotments for Fiscal Year 1974 144

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

(20 U.S.C. 241a) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 27; redesignated and amended January 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title I, secs. 108(a)(2), 110, 81 Stat. 786, 787; amended April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, sec. 113(b)(2), 84 Stat. 126.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 148. (a) There shall be a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "National Council") consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, for terms of three years, except that (1) in the case of initial members, five shall be appointed for terms of one year each and five shall be appointed for terms of two years each, and (2) appointments to fill vacancies shall be only for such terms as remain unexpired. The National Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(b) The National Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs, and make recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal educational programs for disadvantaged children and to the extent appropriate, experience under other public and private educational programs for disadvantaged children.

(c) The National Council shall make such reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) as it may deem appropriate and shall make an annual report to the President and the Congress not later than March 31 of each calendar year. Such annual report shall include a report specifically on which of the various compensatory education programs funded in whole or in part under the provisions of this title, and of other public and private educational programs for educationally deprived children, hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of these educationally deprived children. The President is requested to transmit to the Congress such comments and recommendations as he may have with respect to such report.

20 U.S.C. 241l) Enacted April 11, 1965, P.L. 89-10, Title I, sec. 2, 79 Stat. 34; amended Nov. 3, 1966, P.L. 89-750, Title I, sec. 115, 80 Stat. 1197; redesignated and amended Jan. 2, 1968, P.L. 90-247, Title I sec. 108(a)(4), 110, 114, 81 Stat 786-788; amended and redesignated April 13, 1970, P.L. 91-230, Title I, secs. 112, 113(b)(4), 84 Stat. 125, 126.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION
OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

March 31, 1975

Dear Sirs:

I am pleased to transmit to you the 1975 Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

Members of the Council have spent the year studying the implementation and administration of the Title I, ESEA program nationwide. We have seen projects which need more improvement and have seen examples of programs that raise the educational attainment of disadvantaged children. This year, we plan to determine how much of each Title I dollar actually serves disadvantaged children.

On behalf of the Council, I commend you for your action to place a financial priority on educating disadvantaged children in your fiscal 1976 budget. We share your commitment and are eager to prioritize within the program so that the most efficient delivery of services to children will take place.

The Council has been mandated to advise the National Institute of Education on their statutory study of compensatory education authorized at $15 million. The Council has taken this charge very seriously and is working with NIE to reach the best possible research design and implementation that can be achieved at this time. We have continued to consult citizen groups, parents, teachers, administrators and researchers for their advice for this and our other statutory obligations, and we have continued to channel this advice to appropriate government officials.

The Council has assisted in the development of legislative, policy and procedural changes which I feel will contribute to more effective educational services to all children.

We appreciate the opportunity to serve disadvantaged children and the opportunity to serve our country.

Respectfully submitted,

Owen F. Peagler

Owen F. Peagler
Chairman

The President
The White House

Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller
President of the Senate

Honorable Carl D. Albert
Speaker of the House of Representatives

OVERVIEW

Compensatory education is facing a challenge in 1975. Educational decisionmaking is at a crossroads. The path taken and how priorities are set will impact millions of educationally deprived children during the next decade.

Education for disadvantaged children in the seventies is competing with recently emerged economic emergencies.

High unemployment rates and evident high underemployment rates constrain public coffers severely by reducing tax revenues while adding to public assistance costs.

School systems face higher energy costs and many local educational agencies have been informed that their fuel consumption must be drastically reduced over the coming months.

Declining enrollment is leaving many school buildings and teaching resources underutilized reducing the efficient use of education dollars.

Given the existing situation, new monies will be difficult to obtain for compensatory education. It must be decided who will reap the benefits of the funds that are available. Spreading the funds too thin serves no purpose -- concentration of services must be maintained.

There is a need for creative leadership to focus on these problems and latch on to the opportunity it presents.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (NACEDC) will begin to prioritize its recommendations during the coming year. The NACEDC recommends that other agencies including the Congress, SEA's and LEA's continue their efforts in establishing priorities and focusing upon fewer problems, thereby providing concentration of funds for the most pressing problems of disadvantaged children.

SUMMARY OF COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND POSITIONS

SCHOOL FINANCE

The NACEDC believes that the area of school finance is of vital concern to all Title I schools and participants.

The NACEDC highly commends the action of Congress in establishing the forward funding precedent and recommends the continuation of this practice.

The NACEDC continues its strong support of state efforts for compensatory education and reemphasizes its position that Title I be a two-part program serving the disadvantaged (Part A, formula grant and Part B, matching grant, see page 14).

The NACEDC supports the Title I studies mandated under Public Law 93-380, which plan to update the present measures used to count Title I children and propose alternatives for change. We will study these proposals to ascertain which would best address Council concerns over updating statistics used, and providing the most equitable formula possible.

URBAN EDUCATION

The NACEDC recommends a special Urban Education component of Title I, ESEA to encourage better delivery of needed compensatory education services.

The NACEDC recommends that new legislation be considered to alleviate the inequities in educational services for urban educationally disadvantaged children.

HANDICAPPED EDUCATION

The NACEDC recognizes the current trend of getting the handicapped into the mainstream of education and the need to study this trend to determine its effectiveness on all children.

The NACEDC believes that there is a need for state plans enumerating the performance standards for handicapped programs to safeguard parents and students.

INDIAN EDUCATION

The NACEDC will review the administration of P.L. 93-380 and P.L. 93-368 in order to examine how Indians are continuing to be encouraged to exercise participation and self-determination, particularly in the administration of their schools.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

With the adoption of the nonpublic school bypass provision in P.L. 93-380, the NACEDC will closely follow its enforcement to determine its effectiveness.

PARENTS' RIGHTS

The NACEDC highly commends the action of the 93rd Congress in mandating parent advisory councils, a position strongly favored by this Council. We will follow the formation of parent councils in the states and local school districts with great interest. The position advocated by this Council has been that the mandated public information provision coupled with mandated parent advisory councils will ensure parent and student interests are heard on pertinent school policies.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

It is the NACEDC's position that teacher education will become more effective when the teacher education institutions and school systems work closely together in the development of teacher education programs.

The NACEDC urges a greater effort be devoted to defining uniformly what is meant by competency-based teacher education and its implication for the student.

The NACEDC believes that available statistics suggest the need to switch the teacher education emphasis from preservice to inservice.

The NACEDC believes that unless the inservice education of teachers becomes a stronger component of disadvantaged programs and teacher education, not only will the disadvantaged not be served in schools, but the overall capacity of schools to remain vital, resilient and strong will deteriorate.

The NACEDC urges the Office of Education and State Education Agencies to provide strong leadership in the establishment of higher education-elementary and secondary education cooperation in this redirection of money and efforts toward more emphasis on the inservice education of teachers.

EARLY CHILDHOOD

The NACEDC supports the concept of comprehensive services to children and urges careful study of pending legislative measures to ensure that all aspects affecting these youngsters are considered.

The NACEDC urges federal, state and local governments to continue to develop child and family programs to meet the needs of early childhood. Every effort should be exerted to establish kindergarten as a universal minimum for all American children.

The NACEDC also proposes that states provide their local education agencies with public employment slots to employ individuals who are qualified, to encourage parents to assist with these child and family programs.

CAREER EDUCATION

The NACEDC endorses the concept of career education and encourages the Office of Education and states to use Title I funds for a career education emphasis within the reading and math programs of Title I.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The NACEDC emphasizes a previous recommendation that local expenditures for non-English language development be excluded from the process of determining comparability.

The NACEDC recommends that any LEA with over 5 percent of its students having a dominant language other than English must provide appropriate bilingual/bicultural personnel in the school from state and local funds before the federal requirements concerning comparability are considered to be fulfilled.

The NACEDC recommends that Title I, ESEA funds expended on bilingual programs serve educationally disadvantaged linguistically distinct children. Programs which serve children who are fluent in Spanish or another language but who need skills in English should be served first from available resources of Title VII, and ESAA.

The NACEDC cautions that all program administrators preclude linguistic and racial segregation in the delivery of bilingual services according to the guidelines issued by the Office of Education.

The NACEDC believes it is imperative that parents and educators from the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the children to be tested are meaningfully involved in the development and implementation of the NIE bilingual study in order that linguistically and culturally distinctive populations be represented.

The NACEDC recommends that liaison be established among all federally funded Bilingual Instructional Programs to encourage them to be designed and implemented with greater, positive interrelation.

The NACEDC recommends that greater use be made of broadcasting systems which are federally, state, or privately funded, and further, that states should systematically attempt to create appropriate programming for Title I, target populations.

The NACEDC recommends that training of bilingual teachers include course work and field experience through which a positive relationship with themselves, their students, parents and extended family members may be developed.

MIGRANT EDUCATION

The NACEDC believes that with the influx of non-English speaking children enrolling in migrant programs, highly qualified trained bilingual teachers and teacher aides should be made available, not only for the relatively stable bilingual communities, but also for the non-English speaking migrant student population.

The NACEDC recommends that since many migrant students share the same special needs of all bilingual children, there is a need for a bilingual education component in many migrant programs.

The NACEDC recommends that an immediate ongoing needs assessment of the migrant child is necessary and should be encouraged to prevent losing continuity in the education process.

The NACEDC recommends that a comprehensive secondary school curriculum be developed for migrants to provide them an opportunity to prepare for gainful or maximum employment and full participation in our society according to his or her ability.

The NACEDC recommends that Title I funds be used to establish a General Education Diploma Program (GED) to follow the students.

The NACEDC recommends that some consideration be offered to states who develop a graduation criteria or regulations relevant to eligibility for the GED which would apply to migrant children.

The NACEDC recommends that the Chief State School Officers demonstrate leadership in communications at the state level, and form a unit within their Washington organization to link professionals serving the needs of migrant children.

NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT

The NACEDC supports the inclusion of an educational component in the administration of P.L. 93-495, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

The NACEDC believes that since eligibility of the institutions varies from year to year, some type of clarification in the program requirements from federal and state funding is necessary to better address the needs of these children.

The NACEDC recommends that for Title I purposes, the terms "neglected and delinquent", be clearly defined in order that state and local officials can identify and better serve children residing in state and local institutions.

The NACEDC believes that the cost of adequately training the neglected or delinquent should not be the decisionmaking factor when the successful end result of making them self-sufficient and responsible taxpayers would prove to be both economical and sound planning.

The NACEDC recommends that the newly established Council on Juvenile Delinquency take the leading role in coordinating agency efforts to compile the needed data on Title I services being provided to children in state and local institutions.

LEGISLATION

The NACEDC, in accordance with its statutory obligation, has reviewed the contents of the Education Amendments of 1974, (Public Law 93-380) to determine how the legislation specifically addresses the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. The former Chairman, Mr. Alfred Z. McElroy, testified before both the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to present the various concerns of the Council to these legislators. Many of the Council's concerns including parent advisory councils, nonpublic schools and forward funding were addressed in this law. The NACEDC commends the 93rd Congress for its work on behalf of the educationally disadvantaged.

The implementation of this law will be closely monitored by this Council. Changing legislative intent into reality can only be accomplished by a concise set of regulations coupled with sufficient appropriations. Communications received from state and local coordinators, administrators, teachers and parents expressing their concerns over regulations have been forwarded to the appropriate Office of Education officials. The NACEDC will continue a close working relationship with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW) personnel in translating the legislative intent into administrative reality.

Our own priorities have been condensed in chart form on the next few pages. This format presents both previous Council concerns and recent ones as they are addressed in current legislation.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
SCHOOL FINANCE		
Forward Funding	The President's proposal for forward funding through the use of fiscal year 1974 supplemental appropriations be adopted.	None
Title I formula		
Part A children counted	AFDC statistics should be used in the Title I formula which indicate those children from families in excess of the Orshansky Index. The formula should also provide that all deprived children from families with incomes the same or lower than Orshansky be eligible for services.	Using 1960 census data, counted children from families with incomes under $2,000 and those receiving payments in excess of $2,000 from AFDC. In 1966, 10% of those eligible were base on AFDC statistics. By 1974, over 60% of those eligible were AFDC children.

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
Covered under the General Education Provisions section, and also in H.R. 7130, which states that the President must forward his budget with the succeeding year's request, should Congress wish to act on it.	The Council highly commends the action of Congress in establishing this precedent and recommends the continuation of this forward funding practice.
Based on Orshansky Index, plus 2/3 of AFDC over Orshansky ($4250) multiplied by 40% of state average PPE. SEA's will receive no less than FY 1974 allocations. Each LEA will receive at least 85% of the previous year's allocations.	The Council supports the Title I studies mandated under P.L. 93-380, which plan to update the present measures used to count Title I children and propose alternatives for change. We will study these proposals to ascertain which would best address Council concerns over updating statistics used, and provide the most equitable formula possible.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS	PREVIOUS LAW
Part B State Incentive Grants	Title I be a two-part program serving disadvantaged children: Part A--This formula grant would be funded at the fiscal year 1974 funding level of $1.4 billion, and serve the children eligible under the new formula developed by Congress in the extension of Title I. Part B--This matching grant would respond to States which have contributed monies to serve educationally disadvantaged children from any economic level, and would be matched by Federal allocations to the maximum amount the State will receive under Part A utilizing a State plan reflecting local needs assessment to demonstrate the educational disadvantagement of the children eligible.	Each state's authorization is based on the number of eligibles determined under Part A above multiplied by $1.00 for each .01 that the state effort index exceeds the national index, state entitlements are ratably reduced to appropriations except that no state can receive more than 15% of the total grants made under Part B.
Part C Special Grants for Urban and Rural	New funds be made available under a separate title of ESEA to urban centers for raising the level of educational attainment of urban school-aged population to national levels. Title I be expanded into a combination formula/matching grant as an incentive to state funds to compensatory education efforts.	LEA's eligible which have enrollment of either 20% poor children counted under Title I or 5,000 such children (5% enrollment Grants can't exceed 40% of LEA's basic Title I grant. Payment rates are set at 50% of state or national expenditure, whichever is higher.

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
Retained Part B as in previous law, setting a maximum allocation level of $50 million.	The Council continues its strong support of state efforts for compensatory education, and reemphasizes its position that Title I be a two-part program serving disadvantaged children.
Removes 40% limitation requirement. Provides for payment rate of 50% of state average expenditure. Limits state payments to 12% of national appropriations. The eligible number of poor children are 200% of state average or at least 5% of the total student population. Extended only through FY 1975. Part C of SAFA will replace this section for FY 1976.	With the expiration of this special grant set for FY 1976, the Council believes that an alternative must be developed. The Council will pursue possible alternatives to this section later in the year.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
Comparability (excess costs)	States should be encouraged to spend state funds for compensatory education programs by excluding those state funds from comparability data. There should be a comparability of services requirement to ensure that local monies are not supplanted by Federal funds. The definition of the "Comparability of Services Regulation" be expanded to include the concept that the child's special education needs are being met by state and local funds.	School districts are required to spend at least the same amount from state and local funds in Title I schools as are spent in non-Title I schools.
Maintenance of Local Effort	Legislation require audits and mandate a maintenance of effort provision to monitor the expenditure of funds and to ensure the supplementing and not supplanting of local funds and Federal resources.	Applications for grants must contain descriptions of the purposes for which federal funds are to be expended, in compliance with federal guidelines. As as additional incentive for local tax effort, an authorization is set-aside from the basic grants for states whose tax effort for education exceeds the national average for the preceding year.
Revenue-Sharing	States be encouraged to use 1/3 set-aside of the General Revenue Sharing funds to make additional funds available for compensatory education.	General Revenue-Sharing Act of 1972, Public Law 92-512.

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
State and local funds that are used for educationally deprived, bilingual, handicapped, and those with special learning disabilities, do not have to meet comparability requirements if the funds are to provide services comparable to those provided to similarly disadvantaged children in non-Title I schools.	The Council will closely examine the regulations and guidelines to determine whether the intent of the legislation is obtained.
Provisions are extended in P.L. 93-380.	The measurement of the tax effort as a composite of all community services, will be considered.
Same-- law still in effect.	Will be considered.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
TEACHER-TRAINING and STAFF DEVELOPMENT	Staff development must be a continuing part of the local educational agencies' educational program planned jointly by teachers and administrators, focusing on what goes on in the classroom.	ESEA, 1965
NEGLECTED and DELINQUENT	Efforts be made to consolidate federally funded programs serving neglected and delinquent children in state and local institutions.	ESEA, 1965
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	Vocational Education is another important component of compensatory education and should be integrated into the total learning process of the elementary and secondary school curriculums.	Vocational Education Act, 1968

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
Specified that Title I funds may be used for both pre-and-inservice teacher training. LEA's are also encouraged to develop individualized education plans for each Title I child.	The Council will examine the implementation of staff development in the schools and question if the policies used at the elementary, secondary and university levels are meeting the current needs.
Continues state agency programs for N & D--will receive funds in accordance with the new formula and will continue to receive funds "off the top" of Title I appropriations. P.L. 93-495 consolidates programs previously administered under DHEW and LEAA into a new office in LEAA.	The Council supports the inclusion of an educational component in the administration of P.L. 93-495, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.
Authorizes $17.5 million in fiscal 1975 for bilingual vocational training programs and $17.5 million in fiscal 1975 for bilingual vocational education programs. These funds are designated for adult education; vocational training; training of bilingual vocational instructors; and the development of bilingual instructional resources.	Current uses and/or abuses of the 15% set-aside for disadvantaged children, and other blockgrant approaches for these youngsters, will be examined to determine which approach the Council feels would best address the needs of disadvantaged youth.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
CAREER EDUCATION	Career Education is another important component of compensatory education and should be integrated into the total learning process of the elementary and secondary school curriculums.	None
HANDICAPPED EDUCATION	Services provided for handicapped children should include a larger amount of Title I funds.	Education of the Handicapped Act, 1972, which replaced Title VI of ESEA, 1965.
INDIAN EDUCATION		Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act, 1972.

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
Establishes an office of Career Education within the Office of Education to develop information on the needs of career education and to assist the states to plan and implement career education programs. Authorizes commissioner to make grants to SEA's nad LEA's and other non-profit agencies to establish career education demonstration projects.	The Council endorses the concept of career education and encourages the Office of Education and states to use Title I funds for a career education emphasis within the reading and math programs of Title I.
Extends all existing programs for handicapped until 1977. Increases allocations among the states on the basis of total population, ages 3-21. Requires each state to establish a goal of providing educational opportunity to all of its handicapped children and to provide procedures for safeguarding these children and their parents in decisions regarding identification, evaluation and placement of children.	The Council recognizes the current trend of getting the handicapped into the mainstream of education, and the need to study this trend to determine its effectiveness. Furhter, the Council believes that there is a need for state plans enumerating the performance standards for handicapped programs to safeguard parents and students.
Extends the Indian Assistance Act through 1978. Up to 10% of the funds are to be made available to Indian controlled schools. An annual authorization of $2 million for special training programs for training teachers of Indian children is included, and a program of fellowships for Indian students is also included. P.L. 93-368, Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.	The Council will review the administration of the recent legislation, and the extent to which the Indians, particularly in the administration of their schools, are continuing to be encouraged to exercise whatever participation and self determination each group is prepared and willing to assume.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
MIGRANT EDUCATION	A mechanism should be devised to provide a minimum planning floor of 80% of the past year's allocation, and to have the Uniform Migrant Record Transfer System (UMRTS) adjust the remaining 20% according to current fiscal year needs by reallocating to the states which demonstrate such need.	ESEA, 1965
BILINGUAL EDUCATION	A greater fiscal-pragmatic flexibility be included in the law, the regulations and the guidelines should allow for approval of projects with a series of phases which cover more than two or three years.	Title VII, ESEA, 1965
EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION		Innovative programs under Title III could include funds for early childhood programs.

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
Continues special Title I grant to states to provide education for children of migratory workers (including children of migratory fisherman); established the same rate of payment as for school districts but assured that no state agency would receive less than it did in fiscal 1974.	The Council recommends that the Chief State School Officers form a unit within their D.C. organization to link with state officials serving the needs of migrant children. Further, Title I funds should be available for migrant students to aid in obtaining a General Education Diploma. (GED)
Authorizes appropriations of $585 million in FY 1975-1978 for bilingual education assistance under ESEA; establishes an office of Bilingual Education within OE. Stipulates that $16 million of the first $70 million appropriated annually must be set-aside for teacher training in bilingual education; 1/3 of any amount over $70 million would go for such training.	The Council recommends that the views of bilingual parents, students and professionals be included in the NIE study on bilingual education. Staff members on the study should include those familiar with the backgrounds and problems of these people.
Title VII includes financial assistance at the pre-school level for bilingual education. Under consolidation, funds will be available in 1976 for programs formerly funded under ESEA, Title III. Handicapped and Reading programs include provisions for early childhood education.	The Council will study the several early childhood proposed bills that are now before the 94th Congress to determine which we feel would best address the needs of disadvantaged children.

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS	That enforcement procedures be legislated to provide services for children when there is a breakdown in the federal and local delivery systems. A nonpublic school bypass, to provide relief in cases where the Assistant Secretary of Education determines that a district has failed to provide comparable services to eligible children enrolled in nonpublic schools.	
PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	Parent advisory councils be mandated at state and local levels to ensure local monies are not supplanted by Federal funds.	encouraged
STUDENT PRIVACY (Public Information)	Public information provision be strengthened to include a provision which would protect students and personnel confidentiality in regard to specific information.	None
MAINTENANCE OF LOCAL INITIATIVE	The Council recommends that local initiative be maintained and preserved so that programs are developed which meet the specific needs of educationally deprived children.	encouraged

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
Provides that the DHEW Commissioner could bypass any LEA that was legally unable or failed to provide for participation of educationally disadvantaged nonpublic school students in Title I programs and establish separate services for such children and provides for administratice and judicial review of DHEW "bypass" decisions.	With the adoption of the nonpublic school bypass provision, the Council will closely follow its enforcement to ensure that all eligible nonpublic students' needs are properly met.
New legislation mandates both district-wide and local parent advisory councils.	The Council commends the action of the 93rd Congress in mandating the parent advisory councils, a position advocated by this Council. The Council will follow the adoption of the parent councils in the states and local school districts with great interest.
Parents of students and students attending postsecondary institutions are afforded the right to inspect their school files, and teh release of documents in those files is restricted.	The public information provision, coupled with the parent advisory councils, will ensure that parent and student interests are heard on pertinent school policies.
Both parental involvement and local needs assessment which are needed to assure responsiveness to local initiative are included in the new education law.	The Council commends the action of Congress.

COUNCIL CONCERNS: ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE

	COUNCIL'S PREVIOUS CONCERNS	PREVIOUS LAW
TITLE I EVALUATIONS	Not applicable	GEPA--1968 required the Commissioner of Education to evaluate all OE-funded programs and report annually on their effectiveness.

ACTIONS AFFECTING THESE CONCERNS

PUBLIC LAW 93-380	CURRENT STATUS OF COUNCIL CONCERNS
NIE--study the effectiveness of compensatory education by September 1977, with mandated involvement of this Council.	The Council has established a Committee on Mandated Studies and is working closely with NIE. (see section on Title I evaluations)
SEC. OF COMMERCE & DHEW--expand the current population survey to update the count of children eligible for Title I services.	
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION--study the adverse effects of late funding.	The Committee on Mandated Studies will study the results of these other Title I reports, to prepare materials for future legislative action on Title I, ESEA.
ASSISTANT SEC. OF EDUCATION--study more accurate methods to determine poverty within a year after enactment of the law.	
DHEW SECRETARY--study incidence of crime and violence in schools and report findings to Congress by December 1, 1976.	

SCHOOL FINANCE

Public concern for an equitable system of financing local schools has become a major issue in educational reform. The Council is concerned over the fate of the property tax, which provides the base expenditures for local school districts. The effectiveness of compensatory educational efforts, such as Title I, ESEA, is related to the soundness of the local districts.

The movement for financial reform gained great strength when the California Supreme Court ruled that school spending should not be dependent on the wealth of local districts, in their 1971 Serrano v. Priest decision. Hopes of a judicial remedy were lessened, however, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, in San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, that the Texas system of tax assessment did not violate the U.S. Constitution.

In order to eliminate the mounting problems of educational inequities, by June 1, 1972, each of the fifty states had commissioned study groups to analyze and evaluate existing funding methods and provide recommendations concerning financial reform. The conclusions presented by these study groups have included gerrymandering of district lines, complete state financing of elementary and secondary education, as well as major changes in the educational delivery system.

The reforms proposed and adopted by the states have been in four major areas. First, efforts have been made in some states to effectively equalize the taxing ability of local districts through a system of "district power equalization." In this system the state guarantees the yield per pupil of a given property tax rate. For example, a State Legislature would enact a uniform statewide local tax and assessment rate base for education. Each district would be guaranteed an established per pupil expenditure rate. If the taxes raised through local property assessments do not provide the necessary per pupil expenditures, the state would provide the extra needed funds to the district. Conversely, in those districts raising monies in excess of the established per pupil expenditure rate through the tax assessment, the state would assume control of the excess funds. If a local district wishes to spend above the established per pupil rate, an additional local levy would have to be passed.

Second, there has been a trend in some states to forsake the system of property tax assessments as the basis of local education. These states have put increasing reliance on the state general fund to bear the cost of elementary and secondary education. Monies are raised through increases in sales tax, use tax, business and personal income taxes. Allocation of funds would be dependent on a formula of either average daily attendance (number of students normally in attendance) or average daily membership (number of students actually enrolled).

Changes in the distribution aspects of state educational funds are the third major area addressed in the current trends of legislational reform. Beyond the change from Average Daily Attendance (ADA) to Average Daily Membership (ADM), as cited above, many proposals have provided for the "weighting" of different students. Average costs for maintaining conventional elementary classrooms versus secondary vocational workshops require a balancing of available funds. Weighting each type of student on a scale reflecting the cost of providing them with a quality educational experience allows monies to be more equitably distributed.

The final approach utilized in the area of educational finance reform is the reexamination of the property tax assessment system. Problems of unequal tax assessments and unfair tax burdens are being addressed with new vigor. In most states, low income families and senior citizens are receiving tax relief and homestead exemptions. This type of reassignment of tax burdens will provide only temporary relief.

URBAN EDUCATION

The Council has determined after its studies and site visits that there is a worsening of fiscal problems in the cities. Therefore, urban local educational agencies are increasingly less capable in serving their educationally disadvantaged children. The effectiveness of Title I, ESEA, to raise the educational attainment of disadvantaged children is dependent upon the adequacy of the basic LEA and SEA supported program delivered to the target population. Without an adequate basic program, Title I is not truly extra services, but supplants services which ought to be provided locally.

This supplanting is not a legal exception in the Council's view when it occurs in cities which are fiscally strangled, as long as the LEA has complied with maintenance of effort requirements. It is a violation of the spirit and intent of compensatory education to have Title I monies expanding the basic program, while not providing the extra services these children require and to which they are entitled.

The evidence shows that with the concentration of low and fixed income families, with the very low tax base, higher costs of goods and services, cities are hardpressed for funds for innovative and special quality saturation of educational services.

Therefore, the need exists, the concentration of children is present, the lack of resources is evident, and the opportunity is clear. The NACEDC recommends a special Urban Education component of Title I, ESEA to expedite delivery of needed compensatory educational services.

Further, NACEDC recommends that new legislation be considered to alleviate the inequities in educational services for urban educationally disadvantaged children.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Recognizing the significance of the teacher in the educational development of our nation's children, particularly those who are educationally disadvantaged, the NACEDC established a committee on teacher education for the 1975 annual report year.

In these days of great educational need, changes are necessary in national policies related to teacher education. It is the Council's position that those who prepare and those who employ teachers are in need of answers to a number of critical questions. The NACEDC considers answers to these questions to be absolutely necessary if the needs of the educationally disadvantaged children in America are to be served. A concerted effort is needed at the federal and state level to assess the future demand for teachers and other related educational personnel. This assessment must lead to national and state policies which will bring supply and demand for educational personnel into a more balanced position.

The statistics that are now available on graduates in teacher education vary depending on who is issuing the statistics. The estimates on a surplus of teachers ranges from an extra 412,000 teachers by 1979 to 1,700,000 by 1980.[1]

---

[1] Examples of disagreeing data:

National Education Association-surplus of from 65,000 to 115,000
Syracuse Educational Policy Reaearch Center-from 110,00 to 150,000
Nat. Center for Educational Statistics-800,000 by 1981
Nebraska Study Commission Information Committee-1 million to 1.7 million
Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation-412,000 by 1981

What causes the huge variation?

The annual size of the graduating class with teaching degrees is the key variable in any long-range determination of teacher supply. However, this basic information is put to different use in determining the varying statistics. The data collected by the National Education Association, for example, are based on the total number of graduates in a recent year with either a bachelor's degree or a master's degree. This is misleading since the majority of master's degrees in teacher education are granted to those already having bachelor's degrees. Thus, this is not an increase in the present stock available, but an improvement in the already existing teacher candidates.

Also, in using data based on the total number of graduates with teaching certification, it must be considered that many of these graduates never actively seek a teaching position.

Despite the variation in these studies on the supply of teachers, they all use the same basic technique in projecting the future supply of teachers. The present trend is assumed to continue over the next decade. However, recent studies have indicated that there is a decreasing number of graduates with teaching certification.[1] The annual survey taken of persons entering colleges and universities supports the observation that a downward trend will continue.[1] The major implication drawn from these data is that policy-makers will not be able to assume that the present oversupply of teachers is here to stay in formulating any long-range plans. Data indicate that we may be facing another teacher shortage by 1985.

---

[1] Analysis of the Educational Personnel System: V. The Supply Of Elementary and Secondary Teachers, Rand Corporation, Stephen J. Carroll and Kenneth F. Ryder, Jr. February 1974.

In order to have an adequate supply of teachers one must address the question of "What is an 'effective' teacher?" The late sixties and early seventies produced a score of literature both critical and supportive of the educational system in the United States. However, no absolute results were obtained on the characteristics of an "effective" teacher. Some studies indicate that integration and teachers would have little or no effect on the learning outcomes of children since intelligence was predetermined at birth. Other education literature written since those studies were undertaken have refuted the above findings. Yet, while such writings have maintained that the teacher does affect the student's education, the actual characteristics of this "effective" teacher have been brushed over lightly, if touched at all.

This identification process must be developed to ensure that quality education is a result of our education expenditures. Disadvantaged children are by definition, children whose educational experiences have been unsuccessful, according to available measures. Answers are needed as to which competencies a person must have in order to be able to provide effective education for children. How can the capacity of teacher education institutions be harnessed to produce both a sufficient quantity and quality of their product? Have the teacher education institutions been geared for quantity rather than quality? How should the characteristics of teacher education be determined? Should the teacher educators determine the nature of their product or should those who employ teachers establish the criteria? The NACEDC expects that the capacity of teachers to be effective will be enhanced when the teacher education institutions, and those who employ their graduates, work closely together in both the establishment of criteria and the teacher education function.

---

[1] American Council on Education annual survey of college freshmen. Trend 1969-1973.

There are many available viewpoints on the above-posed questions which have shaped and continue to shape the teacher education programs in America. The viewpoints have played a part in shortages of available teachers and an apparent oversupply of teachers. They have also played a part in the continued operation of teacher education programs which are based on a wide variety of approaches as to what competencies are needed and a similarly wide variety of approaches to the development of teacher competencies.

Currently, various models for teacher education are reported in the literature. Competency-based and/or performance-based teacher education are among the models. There is, however, no common definition within the profession as to what constitutes competency-based teacher education. The NACEDC believes that greater effort must be devoted to defining what is meant by competency-based teacher education and its implication for the child in the classroom.

The NACEDC also believes that available statistics suggest the need to switch the teacher education emphasis from preservice to inservice. If this is correct, to what extent and for how long, should this changing emphasis continue? A further question should be answered as to the present capacity of preservice teacher education institutions to accommodate this change in emphasis. The inservice needs of teachers must be assessed. Close cooperation with those who employ teachers will be needed. Is it possible for teacher education institutions to establish this relationship?

In an attempt to discover what types of programs are presently being offered in our colleges and universities training teachers for the disadvantaged child, and if such a working relationship does now exist, our staff undertook a survey in the fifty states and territories. Collected returns have shown that present programs, for the most part, are insufficient to meet the needs of today's schools. Very few, at present, have any particular program designed for urban and/or rural teacher preparation, and most that did report such courses, were offered on the graduate level. We did, however, compile a listing from our preliminary findings of universities and/or colleges which do offer some type of program specifically for educating the teacher of the disadvantaged child (see Appendix A). The Council realized that this listing is not complete and looks forward to receiving information from any other teacher education institutions which offer such programs.

The Council commends the teacher education institutions which have established the working relationship between the local school districts. This is necessary for effective education for our children. Some institutions have adapted their preparation programs to meet the needs of the local school districts. The Council urges this type of close cooperation for all teacher education institutions.

The needed switch from preservice to inservice emphasis in teacher education should be encouraged by federal and state government. The Education Amendments of 1974 clarifies that both preservice and inservice teacher education are fundable under Title I, ESEA. Teacher Corps has been, and continues to be, a source of funding for teacher education. The concentration of Teacher Corps efforts is changing from the recruitment of interns who will teach in the inner cities following their preservice education to retraining of teachers already in service. This shift in emphasis from preservice to inservice training and the reduced mobility from which it stems has serious implications for the sex and ethnic plurality of education personnel and must not be ignored in the efforts of the Office of Education and state education agencies. The NACEDC believes that unless the inservice education and reeducation of teachers becomes a strong component of teacher education, not only will the disadvantaged not be served in our schools, but the overall capacity of schools to remain vital, resilient and strong, will be diminished. The NACEDC urges the Office of Education and State Education Agencies to provide strong leadership in the establishment of higher education -- elementary and secondary education cooperation in this redirection of money and efforts toward more emphasis on the inservice education of teachers.

While the issues raised above represent a substantial body of critical questions which the NACEDC believes must be addressed, there are also others. These are briefly summarized below.

1. How does teacher tenure relate to (a) competency and (b) serving the educational needs of children?
2. What effect will the declining demand for teachers and other educational personnel have on the ethnic and sex plurality of school staffs?
3. What are the educational implications of teacher reassignment resulting from declining demand?
4. What are the educational and financial implications of the current practices related to salary adjustments for additional education of persons already employed in education?
5. Does the capacity of a teacher to be effective with a disadvantaged child require specialized teacher education programs?

6. What are the educational implications of union or association control of preservice or inservice education of teachers?

7. What is the educational effect of the present "credentialing" system in education?

8. How important is and what should the process be, for monitoring the performance of professionals in education and utilizing the results of such monitoring?

There are obviously a number of gnawing questions on the subject of teacher education and related topics with which NACEDC finds impossible to deal. The Council prefers not to suggest that it is the appropriate body to determine the answers to any of the previously stated questions. The Council prefers to leave these questions in the hands of the federal government, state governments, teacher education institutions, professionals in education and the governing and administrative bodies of the public and private elementary and secondary schools. However, during the next year, the Council will seek information on how these questions are being addressed.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

It is well recognized that each child is an individual whose pattern of growth and development may require different kinds of services in different quantities and at different times. This begins in the home where parenting is teaching. Just as the teacher of older children requires the support of ongoing educational opportunities, the parent-teacher needs opportunities to strengthen his/her parenting in order to provide continuity in the child's life.

Ideally, teaching the child in the home would be the best answer. The Council recognizes that many factors are working against this ideal situation. According to figures published by the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, 43 percent of all mothers worked outside the home in 1971 and one of every three mothers of pre-school children was employed. Twenty-seven million children under the age of 18 have working mothers, most of whom have to work because two incomes are needed -- the father's income is under $7,000/year, or they head the family. As of March 1974 over twelve million children were in families where the father was absent, unemployed or not in the labor force. In families headed by women, the median income in 1973 was only $6,195/year, if the mother worked, and only $3,760/year if she did not.[1]

---

[1] Congressional Joint Economic Committee and Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Figures presented to the joint hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Education and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor, February 20, 1975.

These data point out that the need for child care facilities is acute now and that it will increase over the years. Latest estimates indicate that care in licensed centers and homes is available for only a little over one million of the children needing child care.[1]

The availability of adequate child care is often the pivot on which a mother's decision to work or remain at home turns. Often it is these earnings that keep the family above the poverty line and off public assistance. However, if a mother is unable to find suitable care for her children, she is usually forced to stay at home, relying on welfare allowances for support.

The family's economic requirements are only one aspect of the need. Further, these children have special needs arising out of their individual circumstances. These needs are accentuated if the child lives in a poverty setting. There is very little opportunity for these children to socialize with adults for language practice. Another aspect is the lack of health care and poor nutrition which accounts for a greater frequency of birth defects. To serve these needs, children must be reached early in life. Therefore Early Childhood Education Programs must serve the needs of the child and the family.

Simple custodial care will not solve the problems at hand. Comprehensive services are needed which would run the gamut from health, education and social services for the child, to education and services for the parents of the children served. Such services would provide the needed continuity in the child's life. How?

---

[1] Congressional Joint Economic Committee and Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Figures presented to the joint hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Education and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor, February 20, 1975.

The pre-school setting is a unique place for the education of both parent and child. What type of education?

1. New skills to strengthen innate skills.
2. Techniques for utilizing available community resources.
3. Learning to work effectively with teachers in a relaxed environment.
4. Preparing parents for a more effective role in the now mandated parent councils in elementary schools.
5. Training and educating parents and community people for meaningful work related to child care to eventually become taxpayers.
6. Parents can contribute from their own cultural backgrounds.
7. Bilingual education comes more naturally when parents learn with the young child.
8. Exceptional children, handicapped children and their parents are accepted as equals to eventually take their place in the mainstream of education.
9. Parents can learn about health care, nutrition, and consumer education.
10. The skills of sensitive and talented parents can be used to benefit the community.

This type of training and learning, coupled with comprehensive services that could be provided by an early childhood program, would prevent later damages to children.

The 94th Congress has before it several bills dealing with some form of early childhood education and committee hearings are now being held on two of these bills, H.R. 2966 and S.626. The Child and Family Services Act of 1975 would provide $1.85 billion over the next three years to plan for, initiate, and operate a new program providing a wide variety of services to children and their families.

Activities which could be funded under this measure would include health services, screening for the handicapped, prenatal services for mothers, in-home and center-based day care (part and full-time), and health and nutrition programs.

These components seem to fill the present gap in early childhood education, and the Council will follow the proceedings on these bills with great interest. The Council supports the concept of comprehensive services to children and urges careful study of pending legislative measures to ensure that all aspects affecting these children are considered. We would hope that any bill passed by Congress would be designed to overcome the overlapping and duplication of services now provided in order to reach more children at less cost to the community. The Child and Family Resource Program (CFRP), funded in 1973 under the Program Development and Innovation Division of the Office of Child Development was designed in this way. It builds on linkage with existing services being provided by other agencies whereby all relevant community resources are made available to families.

Demonstration projects were set up in eleven sites for a four-year experimental period covering children from prenatal through age eight. The sites represent each of DHEW's ten regions with the eleventh selected from the Office of Child Development's Indian and Migrant Programs Division. The components of such projects include health, education, social services, handicapped, career development, parental involvement, parent education, bilingual education and volunteer services.

The NACEDC encourages Federal, State and Local Governments to continue to develop child and family programs to meet the needs of early childhood. We should exert all energies to at least establish kindergarten for all American children. We would also propose that states encourage their local education agencies with public employment slots to employ individuals who are qualified to encourage parents to assist with these child and family programs.

The challenge which faces those involved with decision-making in early childhood education is to find the means to face both the sociopolitical and educational issues that will include the complexities of both and still be fully aware of which values are being compromised by which solutions. Constant vigilance must be maintained for the protection and well-being of the children who cannot speak for themselves.

CAREER EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Yearly reviews of Title I programs emphasize the salient fact that motivation remains one of the most desperately needed elements in programs for disadvantaged children under Title I. Career education offers a source of motivation for any student and is especially urgent for the disadvantaged child who already has so many competing and distracting activities impinging on his educational life. It is essential that he learn very early that his courses of study are directly linked to the career choices he will be making and his ability to "make it" in the real world. Each educational step of the way, the child should see some clear relationship between what he is learning and the requirements of his life in the world of work.

THE PRESIDENT OFFERED LEADERSHIP

The Council commends President Ford's early emphasis on the need to "close the gap" between education and work.[1] The President is focusing on one of the greatest needs in public education. Far reaching actions are called for to put the course of American education on the track of preparing and motivating young people to productive and worthwhile careers. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children is anxious to lend its fullest support to such actions. The President and Congress have expressed support to the concept of career education. The times do call for some comprehensive action to bring about the structural changes that are needed.

---

[1] President Ford's Ohio State Speech, August 30, 1974.

COUNCIL ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON CAREER EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

As a result of the judgment that career education offers a basic source of motivation to students, the NACEDC has directed special attention to the potential of career education programs for Title I children in the past year. It came to the Council's attention early in the year that the current regulations inhibited the use of Title I funds for such career programs. Of particular interest to the Council were the facts presented by one of the Texas Title I coordinators that pupils seemed to find greater interest and satisfaction in their instructional programs when integrated into a career education format. The direct linkage of education to specific careers in the world of work added incentive and a clearer sense of purpose to what was being taught.

The Council reviewed the Career Education Model located at Newark, Delaware, as an example of a basic career education program on a K-12 basis. The essential features of instruction are 1) career orientation, 2) career exploration and specialization and 3) specialization. Information from a wide range of other career model sites was also reviewed and on-site visits arranged including the Skyline Center at Dallas, Texas.

It became clear to the Council, from reviews, observations, and analyses that the concept of career education is well received based upon the enthusiastic comments of the students, teachers and administrators as well as the higher attendance and lower dropout rates. After careful review of the national posture of career education for the disadvantaged, however, we find ourselves in strong agreement with the Director of the Office of Career Education in the Office of Education, that, "career education, for minority and low income persons, has, to date, been generally a matter of over promise and under delivery."[1]

Through inquiry, the Council has been advised that Title I funds could be used for reading and math career education programs.

The Council endorses the concept of career education and calls on everyone involved in Title I to reassess their plans with an eye to revitalizing their programs through a career education format.

---

[1] Remarks presented to the National Career Education Conference, the National Urban Coalition, Racine, Wisconsin, Dr. Kenneth Hoyt.

BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EDUCATION

The recognition of the need for Bilingual/Bicultural Education is higher than it has ever been in our history. Congressional Hearings in 1967 officially recognizes the plight of non-English speaking students. The Supreme Court emphasized these concerns in their 1974 Lau v. Nichols Decision (see appendix D). Since that decision, the linguistic needs of these students have been addressed in the Education Amendments of 1974. At the present time, approximately 5.4 million children enrolled in our schools need some form of Bilingual/Bicultural Education.

Bilingual programs are today being successfully conducted in many different parts of the country. Programs for children ranging from pre-kindergarten through high school, in some instances, are using both English and the student's native language as medium of instruction.

Extensive research is still being conducted concerning the bilingual children's reactions. Preliminary indications are known to be positive. One study indicated that the bilingual education of the students broadened their ability to grasp abstract ideas and improved their overall academic performance.[1]

States have already begun developing bilingual education programs which comply with court decisions and the congressional intent of the new legislation on bilingual education. Many states have already adopted laws or have pending legislation in support of serving the non-English speaking population.

---

[1] Study by Wallace E. Lambert of McGill University in Canada.

NACEDC has ascertained that 22 states are responding to the needs of non-English speaking students either voluntarily or through new legislation and court rulings. Our most recent sampling of states providing bilingual education is a revised and updated version of the sampling highlighted in our 1973 Annual Report (see Appendix D).

The Council commends these states and reiterates its last year's recommendation which stated:

Any LEA with over 5 percent of its students having a dominant language other than English must be provided appropriate bilingual/bicultural personnel in the school from state and local funds before the federal requirements concerning comparability are considered to be fulfilled. The Council has underscored the responsibilities of districts which serve more than 5 percent of children whose dominant language is not English. Court tests, such as the Lau decision, have mandated district responsibilities.

The NACEDC emphasizes a previous recommendation that local expenditures for non-English language development be excluded from the process of determining comparability. This would prevent an artificial increase in the per pupil expenditures in attendance areas with large concentration of bilingual children.

The NACEDC recommends that Title I, ESEA funds expended on bilingual programs serve educationally disadvantaged linguistically distinct children. Programs which serve children who are fluent in Spanish or another language but who need skills in English should be served first from the resources of Title VII, and ESAA.

The NACEDC recommends that liaison be established among all federally funded Bilingual Instructional Programs to encourage them to be designed and implemented with greater, positive interrelation. By assessing and pooling of federal, state and local resources, the linguistic needs of disadvantaged children can be more effectively served.

Over the next three years a total of $685 million has been authorized for the purpose of providing additional educational services in both the English and the native language for the linguistically distinct population. Title VII of Public Law 93-380 contains a provision which mandates a 15 percent set aside of funds under this Act to be used for bilingual preservice and inservice education of teachers. Approximately $45 to $60 million is to be used for providing new bilingual teachers, administrators, counselors, and other educational personnel. In addition, an amount in excess of $60 million has been authorized for the development of bilingual graduate education programs. The Office of Education has also been directed to develop between 200 to 500 fellowship programs for bilingual education each year.

In order to realize the greatest benefits from this bilingual/bicultural teacher education program, the Council urges that these programs be organized in consultation with the universities, local schools, linguistically distinct communities and the parents of linguistically distinct children.

The NACEDC recommends that the training of bilingual teachers include course work and field experience through which positive relationship with themselves, their students, parents and extended family members may be developed.

Further, the NACEDC cautions all federal programs to preclude linguistic and racial segregation in the delivery of bilingual education services according to the guidelines issued by the Office of Education.

TESTING

Current testing devices used to measure the educational skills of students whose dominant language is other than English have been challenged. The National Institute of Education (NIE) has been mandated to review the present testing instruments.

NACEDC believes it is imperative that parents and teachers from the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the children to be tested are meaningfully involved in the development and implementation of the NIE bilingual study in order that linguistically and culturally distinctive populations be represented.

Further, the NACEDC is concerned about the available testing devices and recommends that they be selected carefully and their results used with caution. The NACEDC urges the development of tests to fairly and accurately evaluate the linguistically and culturally distinct child.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

This year two programs have been broadcast as bilingual children's programs -- Villa Alegre and Carras Colendas.

Although evaluations have not produced results this early, the one outstanding characteristic of this medium and approach is that children from the dominant culture can learn and appreciate the culture and language of the Spanish speaking. Further, the viewers evidence a positive interest and thirst for learning languages. They appreciate that people don't all speak the same language, and that there is benefit and status to knowing many. They recognize and admire people who are multilingual and who are sensitive and understanding in several cultures.

Educational television programs have been piloted in seven cities and extensive research is being conducted to determine reactions to these programs in the communities they were designed to reach.

Coupled with the fact that educational television is highly cost-effective, and is able to reach the maximum audience with its investment, the NACEDC is optimistic about the effects of bilingual education television.

The NACEDC recommends that greater use be made of public broadcasting systems which are federally, state or privately funded, and further that states should systematically attempt to create appropriate programming for Title I, target populations.

MIGRANT EDUCATION

The Education Amendments of 1974, have expanded the definition of migrant children to include children of migratory fishermen and the "five-year migrant" child. Under the new provision, these children are defined as follows:

> "Interstate migrant is a child who has moved with a parent or guardian within the past year across state boundaries in order that a parent, guardian or members of his immediate family might secure temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture, fishery activities, or in related food processing.
>
> "Intrastate migrant is a child who has moved with a parent or guardian within the past year across school district boundaries within a state in order that a parent, guardian or members of his immediate family might secure temporary or seasonal employment in agriculture, fishery activities or in related food processing.
>
> "A formerly migratory (five-year migrant) is a child who has been an interstate or intrastate migrant as defined above, but who has ceased to migrate within the last five years and now resides in an area in which a program for migratory children is to be provided."

Along with the expanded definition contributing to the additional migratory population, several states are beginning to report more migrants returning to the fields due to the unemployment rate which is steadily on the rise in the nation. Based on these factors, states will be required to provide more services to migrant children.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, Migrant Division, an estimate of 581,000 migrants was recorded in the data bank as of 1974. Of this figure, approximately 380,000 migrant children were active and enrolled in migrant programs. The discrepancy found in these figures has been contributed to those children no longer participating in migrant programs or presumably enrolled in nonproject school programs. The migrant officials report that by 1977, the data bank will reflect an overall total of 550,000 migrant children or more.

Federal dollars targeted to educate migratory workers have also been greatly increased due to the new legislation. An estimate of $300 million has been projected for the next three years. The NACEDC is concerned over how these funds will be orchestrated in view of the various ways officials will have to respond to the variety of needs within the migrant population.

Because of population shifts of these workers which, at times, require immediate reallocations of facilities and services, the requirements for a successful migrant education program are different than those for a regular school program. The NACEDC believes that with the necessity of having the many offices and officials administer these funds, there is a definite need to have these funds monitored to the fullest practical extent to ensure that the maximum dollar is spent on the migrant child. Checks and balances are a must if we are to fulfill the congressional intent of Title I migrant programs.

Looking at the growth of the migrant programs and the increased number of dollars consumed for providing special educational services to this special population, the NACEDC commends the progress made in meeting the unique needs of these children through the use of the Uniform Record Transfer System. In 1967, approximately 43,000 migrant children were enrolled in migrant projects in 44 states. Of the $9.7 million authorized by Congress, $8 million was actually appropriated. Since that time, migrant programs have steadily expanded and in 1974, $78 million was appropriated to serve approximately 380,000 migrant children in 49 states (See appendices F, J and K).

It is estimated that 85 percent of the above children are presently enrolled in elementary programs and only a small percentage in secondary school programs. We have learned that approximately 60 percent of these migrant workers moving within and across the states are non-English speaking, and that 70 percent are of Mexican American extraction. Many of these children use English only as a second language. The NACEDC believes that with the influx of these children enrolling in migrant programs, highly qualified trained bilingual teachers and teacher aides should be made available not only for the relatively stable bilingual communities, but also for the bilingual migrant student population.

Further, NACEDC recommends that since these migrant students share the same special needs of all bilingual children, there is a need for a bilingual educational component in the migrant programs.

The average time spent in one camp site for migrants is usually 25 to 28 days. Therefore, it is extremely important to conduct a rapid needs assessment of the child immediately after his arrival in order to reduce duplication and omission of any services. At least two days following his arrival, arrangements should be made to establish and maintain a rapport with parents so that an accurate assessment of the child's individual needs are met and, also, to allow parents to become actively involved with the child's instructional and supportive services. The NACEDC recommends that an immediate ongoing needs assessment of the migrant child is necessary and should be encouraged to prevent losing continuity in the education process.

This year, the Council conducted a site visit to several migrant camps in Dade County, Florida, and observed preschool and elementary school children benefiting from educational experiences and other personal services. These camp sites were very modern with well-maintained facilities. The principal at one of the schools demonstrated a positive approach in challenging the problems encountered by these students. Teachers and other school personnel were very cooperative in making the learning experiences highly motivated for the children. There was a flexible and individualized approach to the learning being applied throughout the building to meet the educational needs of the migrant students. Activities for these children had been designed to increase parental understanding and involvement and, parents were trained to assist in some of these activities. These programs, in the Council's view, were superior to what is generally available to migrant children (See section on

Successful Projects, Page 97).

Programs for secondary youth differ somewhat from those of elementary school children. Because many of the older youth usually work in the fields during the day, programs are offered during the evenings and on weekends. Since reading and math skills are an important factor in the world of work, these areas of instruction are emphasized the most. However, for these youngsters, vocational and career education programs took on added importance Reality is more than a word to these students, it is a blend of many days of uncertainty in the line of work and unavoidable interruptions in their education achievements. Quoting from the Education Amendments of 1974, Title IV, Section 406 states:

> "It is the sense of Congress that--
> (a) every child should by the time he has completed secondary school, be prepared for gainful or maximum employment and full participation in our society according to his or her ability."

In our last year's Annual Report, the Council recommended that a system of accrual of credits for high school graduation be maintained through the Uniform Record Transfer System so that mobility would not hamper the migrant child from attaining a high school diploma. We have since learned that monthly statistical reports are being prepared on the number of credits students earn during their stay in individual schools. With this breakdown, the data bank can now identify the number of credits earned by participating students. With programs varying from school to school, credits might not necessarily be accepted or be useful but this information is made available to the appropriate school immediately after the student enrolls. The progress toward this goal is being accomplished and the Council commends the Migrant Division in their efforts of making this possible.

It has been reported that the declining enrollment of migrant high school students has become a concern in the secondary schools. This decline can be contributed to many factors when considering the life of a migrant child. Even though we believe many of the programs are well planned for these students, new ideas in compensatory education along with many of the old ones can and have proven successful. Because migrant children do not become stationary long enough to obtain eligibility to get a General Education Diploma (GED), the Council recommends that Title I funds be used to establish a GED Program to follow the students.

Further, in terms of new ideas, the NACEDC recommends that a comprehensive secondary school curriculum be developed for migrants in order to provide them an opportunity to prepare for gainful or maximum employment and full participation in our society according to his or her ability.

The NACEDC recommends that Chief State School Officers demonstrate leadership in this matter and form a unit within their Washington organization which will link with professionals serving the needs of migrant children.

Because of these students' transient way of life, many have been denied a continuous quality education. Moving from school to school not only contributes to poor learning, but prevents the kind of continuity necessary for upward mobility in their education. Once a student falls so far behind in his studies, he eventually drops out of school entirely. He joins the migrant stream, gets married, has a family and the cycle repeats itself. A comprehensive secondary school curriculum could expand their education outlook and reinforce and accelerate what has already been done for these migrant students. This would give them an option to either achieve economic independence or further their educational goals.

Certification for graduation is the responsibility of the local school districts, delegated to them by the states. The Council recommends that some consideration be offered to states that develop a graduation criteria or regulations relevant to eligibility for the GED which would apply to migrant children.

During the State Migrant Coordinators' Conference held in December 1974, migrant coordinators indicated that their communication and liaison between Chief State School Officers at the state level and in Washington, D.C., needed great improvement. They felt that without this type of relationship, students' academic progress could not adequately be assessed due to nonuniformity of evaluation procedures.

The funds being made available through Title I for migrant programs have been without question a major source for strengthening and expanding programs for migrant children. Students who through no fault of their own and who otherwise may not have been afforded an opportunity to participate in academic, vocational and career activities, were given this chance and can now benefit from these educational and work experiences. The Council believes the successes demonstrated in some of the migrant programs have been a stepping stone to greater progress in migrant education and a partial fulfillment in our endeavors to provide the maximum amount of educational services to this special transient population who have no direct voice in our society.

We hope our recommendations herein warrant much consideration from the policy makers and are a prime approach to further meeting the variety of needs of migrant children.

The broader view being demonstrated by the 49 states and local officials in providing these educational services means assisting migrant children in the success and progress they will accomplish in the years to come. Our commitment to the cause is an ongoing process and we shall continue our positive efforts in seeking quality education for all children.

SERVICES TO THE NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT CHILDREN

NACEDC is concerned with the number of youth being classified as neglected and delinquent who are institutionalized without adequate education.

In 1972 persons between the ages of 10 through 17 account for about 16 percent of the nation's population. The 1972 Uniform Crime Reports indicated that 50.5 percent of all arrests for property offenses involved persons under 18 years of age. Each year the juvenile courts handle more than one million youth accused of delinquent and criminal behavior acts. The magnitude of the problem, either as a youth problem afflicting school-aged youth or as part of the national crime problem, is evident.[1]

NACEDC believes that since eligibility of the institutions varies from year to year, some type of clarification in the program requirements from federal and state funding is necessary to better address the needs of these children.

The recidivism is an alarming 75-85 percent rate among juvenile delinquents who have been held in custody. This is twice that which is experienced with adults. It is, therefore, obvious that there is a deficiency in our mode of working with delinquents which must be attacked.[2]

The relationship between juvenile delinquency and the absence of effective delivery of educational services to the neglected and delinquent children dictates the need to expand

---

[1] Uniform Crime Report, 1972
[2] Ibid.

and improve the opportunities for these youth. Social competence and academic achievement must be made available to children in these institutions and it should be presented in a fashion acceptable and relevant to the individual needs of these children.

Once students are able to see the relevance of education and equate its relationship to their future, they would be less likely to drop out of school. They would be less likely to become involved with other dropouts who, in some instances, have already come in contact with the juvenile justice system. When this is accomplished the results are readily noticeable.

At the MacLaren State School in the State of Oregon, for court assigned children, the recidivism rate for non-Title I children was 60 percent. For children who were involved in the Title I Homes (SPEED) Program, the recidivism rate decreased to 30 percent. This was a significant accomplishment and should be the goal of all state and local institutions' programs. From this study alone NACEDC has reason to believe recidivism can be reduced and indeed should be encouraged before it is mandated. (See Successful Projects, page 101.)

Title I, ESEA, includes a provision to provide education or educationally related services to children residing in state and local institutions. Grants are made available to state agencies for institutions that operate school programs, and to local agencies for public and private institutions for delinquents. Projects are designed to serve and meet the most crucial needs of these children.

In the 1973-1974 school year, $22,777,833 was allocated for 46,570 eligible delinquent children residing in state-administered institutions. During this same period approximately $4 million was allocated for the 19,395 eligible delinquent children in the 315 locally administered institutions. The actual number of children receiving services from these federal funds is unavailable. Our efforts to obtain validated and documented data on federal expenditures for the neglected and delinquent population has been to no avail.[1]

Representatives from the various agencies serving this population informed the Council during our July 1974 meeting that much of the information on the institutions and on services provided to children in these institutions would be made available to us. However, our most recent contact with the LEAA Juvenile Justice Division stated that the data on Title I, Neglected and Delinquent programs had not been accumulated. Therefore, Council is unable to make a valid judgment on the services being provided in these institutions because of the lack of reliable and available information.

NACEDC recommends that the newly established Council on Juvenile Delinquency take the leading role in coordinating agency efforts to compile the needed data in this area.

It is estimated that more than one-third of all cases referred to juvenile courts involve young people who have not committed crimes against other persons or property. Further, had these juveniles been adults their actions would not have been considered a crime. The juveniles are referred because of family problems or school incidents, etc. They are described as "persons in need of supervision," and do not belong in the courts. But because of lack of resources in some communities, the court has no other alternative but to institutionalize these children.

---

[1] Office of Education, Division for the Disadvantaged

The time span of these children in these institutions is between 60-91 days. This makes it difficult to relate or mount educational programs in such a short period of time. It is obvious that many of these children have learning disabilities, educational lags, and in most instances failure when involved in the traditional classroom setting.[1]

NACEDC believes that the cost of adequately training the neglected or delinquent should not be the decision-making factor when the successful end result of making them self-sufficient and responsible taxpayers would prove to be both economical and sound planning.

At present, evaluation techniques used by states to identify delinquent children's achievements are objective standardized tests, and there is no adequate test for measuring the progress. In order to accomplish the above goal, it would seem appropriate that funds be made available to establish a small task force whose objective would be to develop a standardized and acceptable means of identifying the academic deficiencies in neglected and delinquent children.

---

[1] Children in Custody, 1973

The term "juvenile delinquency," is applied to a broad range of behavior by young people, both criminal and noncriminal. Too frequently the term "delinquent" is associated with the child who has come within the jurisdiction of the juvenile courts through no fault of his own. The data based on the children's cases disposed by juvenile courts vary. For example, the ages of children and types of cases which the courts have jurisdiction over are established by state laws. Frequently, these laws differ in various states and sometimes vary within the same state. Cases reported by the various courts are usually influenced by the types of organizations and scope of other agencies in a community which have promising alternatives to the traditional correctional institutions for the children.[1]

In New York City approximately 2,800 neglected and delinquent children received educational services in 1974. These services were aimed at improving their levels of achievement in reading and math. Of this number, nearly 100 were placed in institutions as being delinquent, and 1,200 were in correctional institutions. There are about 36 neglected and delinquent institutions located at 91 sites in New York City which range in size to accommodate from 12 to 725 children. Services are provided to children from kindergarten to the 12th grade residing in the institutions for long period of time (9 months to adulthood). The classification of the youth and eligibility of the institution changes from year to year. Educational programs are funded through the state from federal funds (Public Law 89-750). The regulations require the children in state institutions with the most dire need to receive these services, and with the term "neglected and delinquent," being poorly defined this causes misinterpretation of the guidelines and children in need of educational services can be bypassed.

---

[1] Children in Custody, 1973.

NACEDC recommends that for Title I purposes the term "neglected and delinquent," be clearly defined in order that state and local officials can identify and better serve the children residing in state and local institutions.

Prior to the Juvenile Prevention Delinquency Act which was signed into law in September 1974, the Council supported having this new agency placed under the LEAA. With the large amounts of funds already available and because of the existing coordinative network, it was best suitable to administer this new agency.

In the 1973 Second Annual Report for coordinating federal programs for the delinquent population, it was stated:

> "When students are able to see the relevance of education to their future, they are less likely to dropout and less likely to become involved with other dropouts.... Schools that offer relevant curriculums ultimately lead students to more rewarding employment."

However, in examining the Juvenile Justice Act which established an office within the LEAA, we noted that the agency was to administer programs previously located both in LEAA and DHEW. The Act has authorized approximately $380 million over the next three years to combat juvenile delinquency and improve juvenile justice. Formula grant funds will be allocated to states and territories on the basis of population of people under eighteen years of age. Seventy-five percent of the funds under this Act will be for advance techniques to combat delinquency. About one-quarter to one-half of the funds will be made available for discretionary purposes by LEAA, and twenty-five percent of the funds will be used for private, nonprofit organizations dealing with youth. We are in agreement that delinquency programs must respond to the specialized needs of youth with special problems and the NACEDC recommends the inclusion of an educational component in the administration of Public Law 93-495, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

TITLE I, ESEA, MANDATED STUDIES

The Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380), provide for five mandated studies, three of which directly impact Title I, ESEA. The Council serves on advisory boards and coordinating task forces to participate in the discussions and reports of progress of work plans on a periodic basis. The coordination is performed by the Assistant Secretary for Education.

The one study which mandates Council involvement is the three-year compensatory effort mandated by Section 821, to be performed by the National Institute of Education (N.I.E.). The NACEDC must participate in the planning and execution of the study which is authorized to spend up to $15 million. The Council is advisory to the N.I.E. but also may report through its statutory obligation to the Congress. The Council has done all of the above -- participated in the design and development of the study in an advisory capacity, and issued an Interim Report to the Congress after the research plan was presented to Congress in December 1974.

The Council has some serious concerns with the research plan as it now is described, and is working to resolve these differences through a memorandum of agreement with the N.I.E. research staff. Further, the Council firmly endorses the need for a study of compensatory education of this magnitude.

The Council will also examine the plans of the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation of the Office of Education which is mounting an additional study of Title I, ESEA, with an authorization of $25 million beginning June 30, 1975. This USOE study will be a longitudinal study in 450 schools following children for at least five years. The Council strongly recommends the need for a comprehensive longitudinal component in any compensatory education evaluation of this magnitude.

During the meeting in March 1975, the Council resolved that it must closely examine how to intertwine the two studies totalling $40 million of evaluation monies, and to also examine the costs and plans for both approaches. Preliminary findings indicate that these monumental efforts will impact education much the same as the Coleman Report did in 1965, and must reflect the improvements in evaluation skills available today. Further, the Council asks that these researchers hold to the standard that the results must be utilized in a meaningful way and must be presented in a useful manner. That is why the Council is so firm on the design standards -- educators need a quality program, which, with the current average expenditures per program per child, average $300 per child served. Therefore, when the Council will continue to examine these research plans, it must be satisfied that this evaluation money is being spent at least to the efficiency of serving approximately 135,000 children with special services for one year.

The other studies required by the Education Amendments of 1974 which directly concern us are the updated count of eligible and participating Title I children in noncensus years and the poverty count, reviewing current measures of poverty for a better formula. Although the Council is not mandated to participate, we have been closely included in the developments.

The Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380), provided a mandate for the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to find a method of updating the Title I, ESEA count of eligible children in noncensus years.

The legislation required that a way to project the number of children should be devised for both state and substate (county) areas. The studies do not mandate the involvement of the Council, however, the outcome will have an impact on the work of NACEDC.

Another study mandated in P.L. 93-380, concerns a review of the current measures for poverty determination. This review will include analysis of the differing poverty indexes and their impact in the administration of federal programs.

At the present time, two interagency committees have been formed to coordinate the efforts in the studies. The Council is following the work of these committees, and will continue to keep abreast of their review and study.

Data collection and mathematical models have dominated the early efforts of the studies. Next spring, a survey of approximately 160,000 households will be conducted to verify the findings of the Title I, ESEA children count. The final results are not expected for the state level counts until the end of 1976.

The poverty determination review will be presenting their findings at the end of 1975. The Council will monitor this study and assess the impact on compensatory education.

SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS

During the report year, Council members and staff made several site visitations. The programs which were observed by Council and staff members are briefly described in this section. The programs selected highlight the following: focus on reading and mathematics, reducing recidivism rates of neglected and delinquent children in state and local institutions, and exhibited a high degree of parental involvement.

The described programs include urban and rural school districts and various ethnic groups. The reported programs cite the kinds of problems students are encountering in various geographic areas and review the programs which are being attempted in these areas. All reading and mathematics programs described herein have accomplished a month-per-month gain in students' achievements. Programs serving the children in state and local institutions reflect the recidivism rate for these students which had been reduced by one-half upon entering in the program.

The information used to compile the data for these descriptions was obtained from reports and program descriptions collected during the visit, submitted by state and local school districts and from Title I evaluation reports. The major categories of information are (1) area of concentration, (2) goals of the programs, (3) gains made in student achievements, (4) statistics on student participation, and (5) curriculum employed.

The goals of the program and the objectives were designed to meet the assessed needs of educationally deprived children. The objectives varied through these description because they had been specifically developed to meet individual local needs of the students in the individual school districts.

Data on students' achievement gains were provided by standardized tests and subject matter tests, and in some cases, by non-standard measures (i.e. teacher observation). These tests measured the pre and post performance and achievement gains (or losses) made by the participating students.

Basic information on the numbers enrolled in these programs, regular and support services, was provided by the individual local school districts.

Program Title: Corrective Reading Program

Location: Wichita, Kansas

Duration: 1973-74

Number Served: 2,517

Grade Range: Elementary and Junior High

Ethnicity:
Black -- 1,445
Mexican American -- 110
American Indian -- 40
Oriental -- 18

Area Served: Urban

Source of Funding: Title I, ESEA

Expenditure: $264.30 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: Improve Title I eligible students' basic reading skills of vocabulary and comprehension.

Objectives: Students enrolled in the program will increase their reading instructional grade level of at least a month per month on the pupil's performance on grade test, word lists, or other measures.

Students will expand their sight vocabulary and strengthen word attack skills as measured by diagnostic tests.

Students will elevate their level of comprehension and demonstrate an observably improvement in their attitude toward reading and themselves and others.

Students will show improvement in language areas and communication skills.

Context: Wichita is a metropolitan community of approximately 263,000 inhabitants located in south central Kansas. Pupils enrolled in the public schools and reported by the county welfare department as receiving Aid to Dependent Children were determined to be about 9,100 in September 1971. This represents 15 percent of the public school population and an estimate of 10 percent of the total family units with children under the age of 18 years old.

Within the city there are a total of 140 schools which serve approximately 67,000 children. There are 104 public schools; 82 elementary; 16 junior high; and six senior high. About 6,000 individuals were estimated to come from low income homes.

A needs assessment was done to determine the number and percent of high and achievers in reading based on the 1972 basic test program. Three tests were employed: The Metropolitan Readiness Test for first graders, Metropolitan Achievement Test for second graders, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in the upper grades.

Program Description:

Students with specific skill deficiencies were enrolled in the corrective reading program which consists of six phases: identification, screening, diagnosis, scheduling, instruction, and evaluation.

Special reading teachers and paraprofessionals were assigned to one or more, up to four, attendance centers to work with students in small groups (2-8) for thirty to sixty minutes, three to five times per week. These teachers met with approximately 50 to 70 students per day. The program was designed to place more emphasis on services rendered, extend greater support for teachers and develop a systems instructional approach in the selected Title I attendance centers and a program for severe correctives.

Personnel:

In the elementary schools there were three centers to a school with two special reading teachers and 16 reading aides. The junior high school was staffed with 10 teachers and 11 reading aides. The special reading program for severe correctives (grades 4 through 9) were conducted in three centers, two at the CEC building and one one-half day at the Lawrence Elementary Schools. Services were provided for 120 to 150 students.

Parent Involvement:

Parent participation was a built in factor in the corrective program. Special reading teachers' time allocated four-fifths of the day for pupil instruction and one-fifth for parent visitation and consultation. Parents were involved in the Title I Parent Council in the recruitment of additional paraprofessional aides. To ensure direct communication between parents and the reading staff, representatives were present at most of the parent council meetings.

Results:

Using the standardized ITDS tests, students made gains of 1.3/1 in reading.

Program Title: Title I Reading Program

Location: Dougherty County Public Schools
Albany, Georgia

Duration: 1973-74

Number Served: 1,120 students

Grade Range: One through six

Ethnic Group: Black 60%
White 40%

Area Served: Urban

Source of Funding: Title I, ESEA

Expenditure: Less than $250 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: Enable students to increase their growth by utilizing a center concept and individually prescribed instructions.

Objectives: Students enrolled at the centers receiving 50 minutes daily instruction for nine months would improve their reading achievements by a mean gain of at least a month per month as measured by their pre and post tests on the Gray Oral Reading Test, Slosson Oral Reading Test, and CREAD.

Students in the lower groups in Title I schools develop their skills to facilitate their improvement of reading achievements to at least a month per month of treatment.

Selected teachers working with the disadvantaged students in the area of reading were able to improve significantly their competencies in classroom management as evidenced by comparison of pre and post test scores of the students.

Context: Dougherty County Public Schools is located in the heart of Southwest Georgia, and is chiefly an urban community. The schools enrolled in 1973-74, 24,408 students who were approximately 40 percent white and 60 percent black. There are 23 elementary schools, and 12 meet the Title I criteria. 1,120 students from the 12 Title I schools participated in reading laboratories.

Statewide testing results indicated that the Dougherty County's norms in reading were lower than the national norms. The systemwide testing at the sixth grade level indicated that the total population of Title I schools had evidenced mean annual gains in reading achievement of .67 of a year. During the 1973-74 school year, 1, 030 failures and 666 dropouts were reported.

Students were pre-tested in September and post-tested during the first week of May, after eight months of treatment. Data from these tests were examined to determine the level of significant mean gains made by grade level.

Program Description:

Students enrolled in the laboratories received fifty minutes of instruction daily in a classroom organization which offered a high level of individualized instruction. The case loads of the centers ranged from eighty to one hundred twenty (120) students per day.

Each reading center was staffed with one teacher and one paraprofessional. Teachers and teacher-aides were supervised and trained by a full-time reading supervisor and by outside consultants. Inservice workshops included over eighty hours of training.

Activities included workshops in classroom management, identifying the problems attribution to the student's deprivation, and diagnosing and correcting these problems.

Results:

Students who received this intensive supplementary reading instruction showed gains at the .01 Alpha level or better as compared to their own previous reading achievement which had been measured by the accuracy scores on the Gray Oral Reading Test, the Sloson Oral Reading Test and CREAD.

Program Title: SWRL

Location: David Crockett Elementary School
Dallas Independent School District
Dallas, Texas

Duration: 1973-74

Grade Range: One through three

Number Served: 280

Area Served: Urban

Ethnic:
Mexican American -- 52.26%
Anglo -- 40.02%
Black -- 4.99%
American Indian -- 2.61%
Other -- .12%

Source of Funding: Title I, ESEA

Expenditure: $4.00 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: To raise the reading and language arts scores of disadvantaged children in grades 1 through 3.

Objectives: Participating children will master the basic skills of the English language communication.

Participating children will make at least a month per month gain in reading as measured by MRT Form A.

Context: David Crockett Elementary School is located in Dallas, Texas. It is one of the 42 Title I schools in Dallas Independent School District, and one of six schools using the SWRL reading program. This school year 1973-74, approximately 280 children in grades one through three were served.

Test scores indicated the students entering the first grade had scored 49 or below on the Metropolitan Readiness Test Form A, as compared to the large city norms.

Program Description:

All students entering the first grade at David Crockett were given the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form A, during the first week of September. Based on these test scores the students were placed in SWRL program. Students in grades 2 and 3 were placed in the program on their previous scores (if available) and the fall tests.

The SWRL Reading Program is based on three premises: (1) spelling-to-sound correspondences are basic to learning to read; (2) vocabulary for reading materials should match the vocabulary of the child; and (3) reading skills should be extended to tasks useful to the child in his academic and personal endeavors. Instructional emphasis is on decoding, comprehension skills, and sight word vocabulary. The program is designed to provide enjoyable as well as successful experiences.

The word attack skills are developed by learning decoding skills and sight words which enable children to expand their reading vocabulary.

The comprehension skills are developed by a study of word, sentence, and paragraph meanings within a variety of contests; including a wide variety of literal and interpretive information processing activities.

Children receive 84 paper books to form their own home libraries. Each child also receives a workbook for all supplementary activities.

Personnel: Program Facilitator
SWRL Building Aide
Classroom Teacher

Treatment:

Students were placed in the program according to the program placement aide to determine appropriate block of instruction.

Parent Involvement:

Informing parents, educators and community members about the Communication Skills program was an important factor to the success of the program operation. News releases and group meetings were used to promote initial and continued parent and community support of the program.

Parental workshops were held to inform parents of the program. The involvement of parents was on a daily basis because students took all work home and instructions for parents were included to help the student with assignments.

Test Used:

Grade 1 -- CAT
Grade 2 -- CAT
Grade 3 -- CTBS

Results:

In grade 1, of the 26 students pre/post tested, 14 students had more than a 1.7 gain, and 9 of the 14 students had a 2.0+ or more gain.

In grade 2, of the 56 students pre/post tested, 37 had a 2.0+ gain.

In grade 3, of the 48 students pre/post tested, 24 had a 2.0+ gain; 31 had a 1.5+ gain.

	Pre and Post Test	Mean Entry Score	Exit Mean	Mean Gain
Grade 1	26	.6	1.3	.7
Grade 2	56	1.3	2.6	1.3
Grade 3	48	2.2	3.3	1.1

Program Title: Learning Through Piano

Location: Dallas Independent School District
Dallas, Texas

Duration: 1974-75

Grade Range: Two through Six

Ethnic: Mexican American -- 6.6%
Black -- 93.4%

Area Served: Urban

Source of Funding: Title I, ESEA

Expenditure: $78 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: Improve academic achievement through the refinement of psycho-motor and aural and visual perceptual skills using piano instruction as a tool as well as to play the piano musically and with understanding.

Objectives: Give each student music experiences relating to his own culture and cultures of others (through flexible materials).

Assure the development of concepts and skills necessary to play the piano musically and with understanding.

Help students learn to share their thoughts, feelings, understandings, and talents with each other while working toward common goals.

Encourage the development of imagination and creative ability through improvisation and original composition.

Build music concepts and skills in such a that will allow students' success and reinvolvement in reading and math.

Give students an acceptable way to gain recognition from peers, parents, and the community.

Context: The Paul L. Dunbar Community Learning Center is charged with the task of developing programs and curriculum to raise achievement levels of inner city children. The music component of the Center includes a program group piano instruction as well as developmental programs in classroom music and string/orchestra instruction.

Children from the inner city are involved in a planned musical environment that incorporates the Dunbar developed criterion referenced piano curriculum. This curriculum is based in knowledge of how these children learn and what music can do for them.

Emphasis is placed on developing musical skill through analyzing, creating and performing. Opporutnities are provided to children in music through the keyborad for expressive purposes. The structure of the program is designed to make optimum use of group interaction while considering individual variables within the group.

Program Description:

Learning through the piano has levels of instruction from beginning through advanced in the second grade through the sixth. Students remain in the program throughout their elementary school years, progressing at their own rate of learning. Periodio evaluation provides an analysis of progress for the student and teacher, helping to determine an appropriate plan of study for individuals as each new phase of learning is approached.

Two thirty-minute lessions per week are scheduled during the school day in nonacademic class periods. Lessons are taught in converted classrooms equipped with three to six electronic or conventional pianos. Also, inlcuded in the equipment are overhead projectors and tape recorders furnished by individual schools.

The only requirement for participation in this program is parental permission. However, because the demand for involvement has been so great, random selections are made from students who have received this permission.

Results:

Participant enters into the program in the second grade and remain until the sixth grade.

Using the California Achievement Test, the following gains were made by participants compared with a comparison group:

Pre Test

6th grade participants	1.8	comparison group	1.9
5th grade participants	1.7	comparison group	1.5
4th grade participants	1.7	comparison group	1.9
3rd grade participants	1.8	comparison group	1.6

Post test

6th grade participants	6.0	comparison group	4.7
5th grade participants	4.4	comparison group	4.1
4th grade participants	3.9	comparison group	3.5
3rd grade participants	3.2	comparison group	2.9

Program Title: Parental Involvement Program

Location: District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

Duration: 1974-75

Ethnic: Black -- 85%
Other -- 15%

Area Served: Urban

Number Involved: 5,000 Title I parents

Source of Funding: Title I, ESEA

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: Encourage broad parent participation at the local, regional, and citywide levels in order to strengthen the impact of parent involvement in Title I programs.

Objectives: Parents are provided the opportunity to serve as vehicles for direct involvement in programs at the local regional and citywide levels.

Parents are provided the opportunity to participate in classroom activities and to reinforce learning experiences in the home by making them familiar with the educational programs and structuring role in Title I programs.

Parents are provided an opportunity to take part in work opportunity programs which seek to obtain employment information and placement for them.

Context: The District of Columbia Public School System is located in an urban community in the southeastern section of the United States. The schools in 1974-75, enrolled 132,306 students who were 85 percent Black and 15 percent other. There are 137 elementary schools, 30 junior high schools, and of these, 60 elementary and 17 junior and 8 nonpublic schools have been identified to receive Title I services. Approximately 20,000 students from these public and nonpublic schools participate in Title I programs.

Parents of Title I students were contacted about parental involvement opportunities in these schools. The goal of this school system is to actively involve seventy-five percent or more of the parents in school-related activities during the 1974-75 school year through the structured activities of a parent involvement component.

Program Description:

The District of Columbia Public Schools conduct extensive training programs for parents of Title I children and provide them with opportunities for developing leadership skills. The training covers such necessary areas as communication, decision-making processes, role perceptions, group dynamics, parliamentary procedures, program planning, monitoring and evaluations, Title I regulations, guidelines and policies and school and community relations.

An outreach effort is ongoing to ensure broad participation and to bring in parents who might otherwise not feel comfortable in school. Dissemination of information is emphasized in an attractive newsletter and various companies develop materials for parents.

The program focuses on:

1. assisting staff and parents in improving the services they provide to students using reading and mathematics materials;
2. assisting staff and parents to integrate effective teaching in the curriculum, and;
3. assisting staff and parents in becoming more knowledgeable and aware of the teaching/learning processes and the learners whom they serve.

Activities used to accomplish these objectives originate at the classroom building, regional and districtwide levels. They include orientation sessions, inservice courses, conferences and conventions, related workshops, meetings and seminars. These activities are carefully planned, posted in a well circulated calendar and well attended.

Results:

The success of this multifaceted program toward parent involvement can be seen in the broad based support which the parents of Title I children have given in the program.

Program Title:	Bilingual Education Program
Location:	William B. Travis Dallas Independent School District
Duration:	1974-75
Number Served:	Approximately 2,040
Grade Range:	Kindergarten through grade 5
Ethnic:	Mexican American -- 84.14% Black -- 13.33% Anglo -- 2.53%
Area Served:	Urban
Source of Funding:	Title I, ESEA Title VII, ESEA
Expenditure:	$360 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: Develop a positive self-image, enhance concept development and promote functionality in two languages - Spanish and English in all children.

Objectives: To facilitate the development of a positive self-image in all children, the program is developing and implementing curricula in Spanish and in English that will allow the children to acquire concepts in the language they understand best. Students develop a cadre of highly trained personnel in bilingual education that will grow in understanding of and empathy with the sociocultures of all children, and parents are encouraged to participate in the total bilingual program.

Context: William B. Travis is located in the Dallas, Texas area. It is one of the eight public elementary schools in the Bilingual Education Program serving approximately 2,040 students in 86 classrooms.

Program Description: Students enrolled in the program will increase their competency in speaking, reading, and writing in their dominant and second languages, and will also increase their understanding of their history and culture background.

Students will achieve a significant increase in bilingual competence, oral and written language skills through instructions from teachers and teacher aides who have had comprehensive inservice training programs provided by the Dallas Independent School District.

Parent Involvement:

Approximately 1,125 parents are actively involved in the bilingual program. 89.74 percent have been contacted and are involved in the learning process of the children. After contacting approximately 83.01 percent of these parents, 99 percent felt that their child had been interested in coming to school than they did before enrolling in the program. About 55 percent of the parents have made visits to classrooms and felt that their presence had been welcomed in a positive manner.

Results:

Four criteria were used to evaluate the program, criterion referenced tests showed gains of 21.01 percent compared to the pre and post tests.

ESL indicated gains of 78.14 percent
SSL indicated gains of 49.10 percent

The standardized tests used were MRT, CAT and CTBS.

Students in the first grade tested by CAT showed gains of 18.08%
Students in the second grade using CAT showed gains of 42.18%
Students in the third grade using the CTBS showed gains of 29.99%
Students in the fourth grade using the CTBS showed gains of 16.21%

The overall average gains made by all students in the program were 43.03%.

Program Title:	Early Childhood Learning Program
Location:	Redlands Labor Camp and Everglades Migrant Camp Dade County, Florida
Duration:	1973-74
Number Served:	Redlands Everglades -- 250 - 300
Grade Range:	Preschool (ages 3 - 5 years old)
Ethnic:	Cuban 31% Anglo 40% Black 31%
Area Served:	Rural
Source of Funding:	Title I, ESEA
Expenditure:	$1,520

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Programs:	Provide the migratory families an educational environment responsive to the needs of their young children.
Objectives:	Provide opportunities for the maintenance of good health and physical growth through adequate nutritional food, rest, physical activities and medical attention. Provide experience and activities for the development of self-confidence, positive self-image and self-awareness. Provide a well planned educational program with various opportunities for understanding the social environment, aesthetic world and physical environment. Provide language experiences and activities to develop the necessary verbal ability for effective expression and communication with others.

Provide planned experiences and activities for the development of basic concepts, skills and appreciations, career awareness and healthy attitudes toward people and things.

Provide opportunities for the parents and siblings to be involved in the child's school experiences.

Provide a continuous program of inservice activities for teachers and assistants during regular school hours or at other times as needed in addition to preschool inservice.

Context: Redlands Labor and Everglades Migrant Camps operate pre-school programs for three to five year old migrant children. There are 15 migrant units broken down by age levels serving approximately 300 children. The maximum class enrollment for each age level consists of:

15 - 3 year old migrant children
20 - 4 year old migrant children
20 - 5 year old migrant children
15 - combination of age levels involving three year old migrant children
20 - combination of four and five year old migrant children.

Children must attain a required age on or before January 1, of the current school year, and priority is given to five year old migrants not being served by a local program.

Program Description:

Programs are designed to focus on an educational environment at an early intervention of the migrant child's life.

Migrant children enrolled in these programs were given an opportunity to receive good health and welfare services through adequate nutritional food, rest, physical activities and medical attention.

Migrant children were provided a well planned educational program with varied opportunities for understanding their social environment.

Migrant children were provided an opportunity to gain experience and participate in activities aided in developing self-confidence, positive self-image and self-awareness.

Migrant children were provided an opportunity to develop the necessary verbal ability for effective expression and communication with others through the use of language experiences and activities.

Teachers and assistants were provided continuous programs of inservice training, as needed, for working with the migrant preschoolers.

Personnel:

Each unit consisted of one teacher, and two full-time assistants who worked directly under the supervision of the principal of the designated school. Head teachers, migrant coordinators and regional early childhood consultants were available when needed to coordinate programs for the students enrolled in these programs.

Parents:

Parents of the migrant children were involved in the children's school activities and were also given priority for employment as assistants in the school programs. There was also an ongoing effort made to encourage parent participation.

Results:

The Preschool Inventory data were analyzed on a "four-year old" basis. This was done because the entry on the group data recording sheet was "three and four year olds". The contractor was not able to separate the three's from the four's and therefore presents the results on the basis of four year old norms.

Four Year Olds--Preschool Inventory

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Mean Raw Score	25.4	41.2
Percentile (4.0-4.5 norms)	35	---
Percentile (4.6-4.11 norms)	23	74
Percentile (5.0-5.5 norms)	---	61

These data indicate substantial gains for the "four year" old sample.

Program Title: Education Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children

Location: MacLaren School
Woodburn, Oregon

Duration: 1974-75

Number Served: 350 students

Ethnic:

Anglo	294
Black	-- 25
American Indian	-- 11
Mexican American	-- 6

Source of Funding: Title I, ESEA

Expenditure: $600 per student

Program Characteristics:

Goal of Program: Provide an academic environment and a variety of meaningful learning experiences conducive to achieving optimal gains in academic skills for disadvantaged remedial adolescents between the ages of 12 - 17.

Provide a social environment and a variety of meaningful social experiences conducive to the development of healthier students self-concepts, better attitudes toward others, the community, the school and preparation of the student for a successful reentry into the community setting upon release from agency.

Objectives: To show student gains of at least one-half grade level in reading and math skills by comparing pre and post achievement test scores.

To show the ability of the student to make a satisfactory reentry into the community setting by achieving a recidivism rate of 30 percent or less.

Context: The MacLaren School is located between Salem and Portland, Oregon. There are about 300 male students and about 40 - 50 female. (Females have just begun to be accepted at this agency.) All of the students are committed by the courts for one reason or other. The age limit goes to 21 years of age and the heaviest concentration of students range between 14 - 15 years of age. The school is run in the traditional manner and serves six year olds through the twelfth grade. There are approximately 250 students in the school at the at the present time, and an additional 24 are currently involved in a GED program with vocational training. All students are expected to attend school. The school rooms are small and the teacher pupil ratio is about one to twelve.

Program Description:

Students enrolled in the program receive an intensive program planned for remedial instruction with an emphasis upon basic skills, sociolization and the broadening of experimental background.

Needed social and academic information regarding the students is gathered from the public schools prior to developing this program and pre-placement for each student at his school in order that both the student and staff become familiar with expectations and give staff an opportunity to zero in on any visible problems prior to actual placement.

In addition to regular services provided by the school, the student's educational needs are reassessed in order to provide him with indepth basic skill education. The school utilizes high motivational devices such as bachelor living, group interaction, individual interest pursuits, etc., which is integrated in the learning of the basic skills.

Title I teaching staff, residential personnel and counselors work hand-in-hand with these students in order to establish mutual goals through practicing inter-departmental participation.

Parent Involvement:

Parents were involved with the students in that they were included in evaluation sessions, therapy sessions on a regular basis.

Results:

The average length of stay of a student in this program is about 23 weeks and the recidivism rate of these students had decreased to 30 percent when compared against a 60 percent recidivism rate for the rest of the students not involved in this program.

References

1. Univeristy of Connecticut , 226 Exemplary Programs for Disadvantaged Children, 1974.
2. Office of Education, Exemplary Programs, 1974
3. Florida State Department of Education, Title I, Child Migrant Programs, 1974-75
4. District of Columbia Public Schools, ESEA, Title I, Comprehensive Program, 1975
5. Oregon State Department of Education, Title I, Evaluation Report, 1974
6. Dallas Independent School District, Evaluation of Paul L. Dunbar Learning Center 1974
7. Department of Education, State of Hawaii, Compendium of Compensatory Activities, 1973-74
8. Georgia State Department of Education, A Cost Study Analysis of Measured Gains in a Reading Program Utilizing Individualized Instruction, October 1974

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Compilation of NACEDC collected returns from universities and/or colleges offering curriculum specifically designed for educating the teacher of the disadvantaged child. The Council would appreciate hearing from other universities and/or colleges who also offer such programs, since a national compendium of this type is not available in the Federal agencies.

APPENDIX B

Compilation of current state-by-state legislation showing the differing state mandates and programs available for handicapped children.

APPENDIX C

Explanation of the most recent court cases affecting bilingual education, from 1970-1974.

APPENDIX D

Compilation of current state-by-state legislation affecting bilingual programs. This listing represents the most recent complete survey of bilingual education legislation.

APPENDIX E

Allocations available for FY 1975 for State Programs affecting Migratory Children, from the Office of Education, DHEW.

APPENDICES F & G

Data reflecting the number and rate of Delinquency cases brought before juvenile courts during the periods from 1957-1972, with type of court involved, urban, semi-urban or rural.

APPENDICES H & I

Number of formula children counted for FY 1974 and 1975 allocations by State and local educational agencies.

APPENDIX J & K

Title I ESEA allotments for FY 1974 and 1975.

Appendix A

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING SPECIALIZED TRAINING TO TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
ALABAMA									
University of Alabama	X	X	X		X	X		Reality-Oriented Teacher Education (ROTE) combines preservice and inservice training and brings the teacher educator and his trainee into maximum contact with pupils and teachers in the public schools.	Harold W. Heller, Ed.D Head, Special Education
ARIZONA									
University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona	X	X	X	X	X	X		Program for Multicultural education prepares students to educate students of all culturally diverse areas.	Dr. M.M. Gubser, Director, Multicultural Education Center, College of Education
CONNECTICUT									
Southern Connecticut State College	X	X	X	X	X	X		Students in all areas of professional studies have at least one semester's experience in urban schools. A minor concentration in urban studies is available to students on both the undergraduate and graduate levels.	Helen Rakieten Professor of Education
ILLINOIS									
Roosevelt University Chicago, Illinois	X	X	X	X	X			In addition to their regular undergraduate and graduate programs in early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary teacher education, this University offers a M.A. degree in bicultural studies and a M.A. degree in Administration and Supervision, with emphasis on the urban school system.	Robert H. Koff, Dean College of Education

- 107 -

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
ILLINOIS (cont'd)									
Northeastern Illinois University Chicago, Illinois		X			X	X		This university offers a M.A. degree in INNER CITY STUDIES designed for students who intend to work in the inner city. They also offer a M.A. degree in Special Ed. designed for teaching the CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED.	Glen R. Thompson, Ph.D., Chairman, Special Education
INDIANA									
Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	X	X			X	X		Highlighted in 1973 by AACTE for distinguished achievement, the teacher's college at this University enters their students in experimental elementary and secondary teacher education programs in the freshman year. Throughout the four years, students work in various school settings to enable them to function well in any type of school environment, including those described as disadvantaged or multicultural.	Leslie J. Mauth Associate Dean-- School of Education
KANSAS									
Emporia Kansas State College Emporia, Kansas	x	x	x	x	x	x		Cooperative teacher education program with the rural districts in Kansas Flint Hills area to develop community involvement along with competency based teacher education and more opportunities for disadvantaged youth.	Dr. V. J. Bowman Chairman-- Department of Curriculum and Instruction

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED.	BIL.	URBAN	RURAL	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
MASSACHUSETTS									
Worcester State College	X	X	X Learning Disabilities		X			Concentration on urban education in the teacher training curriculum is one of the alternatives offered. A master's degree program in urban education is also offered with concentration in teaching in an urban area. Both programs provide the needed inner city experience.	Helen G. Shaughnessy Associate Academic Dean
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	X	X	X	X	X			All teaching programs offered here are oriented toward a specific kind of student, school, curriculum or community involvement.	Dr. Richard Clark Assistant Dean for Teacher Education
MICHIGAN									
Hope College, Holland, Michigan	X		X	X				A curriculum to prepare teachers for bilingual areas is in the planning stages at Hope College.	Dr. Lamont Dirkse, Chairman of Education
University of Michigan Ann Arbor	X	X	X		X			The program correlates University instruction with direct field experience in the schools and involves the instructors, local school staffs, students and the community in the development of the total program in urban education.	Dr. Bernadine Denning Director of Urban Education Program

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/ UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
NEW JERSEY (cont'd)									
Burlington County College	X		X			X		This community college is involved in training paraprofessionals for migrant education. Its special education program is still in the planning stages.	Mr. Walter Hughes, Career Program Coordinator
NEW YORK									
SUNY College at Geneseo New York State Migrant Center	X	X	X			X		Program provides for direct involvement with such migrant problems as housing, legislation, education and community attitude. Develop methods and materials for working with these students at their learning levels and speeds. The Center also conducts summer workshops for teachers of migrant students throughout New York State, as well as several other full year projects directed at improving education.	Dr. Gloria Mattera Director of the Center
Brooklyn College	X	X	X	X	X			Performance-based teacher education program which involves the student early with actual teaching experiences and concentrates the curriculum on the needs of the classroom.	Shirley U. Wedeen Curriculum Coordinator

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
MINNESOTA									
Macalester College Augsburg College Hamiline University College of St. Catherine College of St. Thomas	X				X			These five college have banded together to form a consortium to offer an urban education program to their students. The program focuses on early experiences for their students in the schools and as the Center of activities.	Ms. Patricia Mullen Urban Affairs Coordinator, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota
College of St. Scholastica Duluth, Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X			The College is committed to a program of individualized instruction, which de-emphasizes grade-levels and better equipes teachers to understand the student's needs in all situations. "Contract" learning is used for both the student-teacher himself and the students he teaches.	Dr. Philip Richards, Chairman, Department of Education
NEW JERSEY									
Rutgers University Newark, New Jersey	X	X		X	X			Program is designed to assess the effectiveness of cross role training and team formation and placement. Each team is comprised of practicing administrators, administrative interns, cooperating teachers, teacher interns and teacher assistants. This microcosm of the school system is to provide the interaction and integration of role relationship in the schools, and combine theory with on the job training.	Fred Means, Lecturer and Director of Project WE

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
NEW YORK (cont'd)									
Syracuse University		X	X		X			This M.A. program is directed toward inner-city children and particularly toward those who are unable to adjust to and/or have been excluded from the public schools.	Dr. Peter Knoblock School of Education
New York University		X			X			This graduate program is primarily focused on early childhood education with its emphasis in urban settings and providing training for the Trainers of Teacher Trainers.	Dr. Edward G. Ponder Director TTT Project
OHIO									
University of Akron		X			X			All courses in this graduate program are designed to help the student understand the unique characteristics of "core" areas and the people that reside there.	Marion Ruebel Assistant Dean of Education
Central State University Wiberforce, Ohio	X		X	X	X			This University has both a Career Opportunities Program and a Training Institute for teacher preparation. The training institute has the goal of achieving more effective teaching of minority students through the retraining of teachers. The COP program provides inservice education for the public school and university staffs working with the students as well as preservice training for low income paraprofessionals.	Edward L. Wingard Dean of Education

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
OHIO (Cont'd)									
Kent State University Kent, Ohio	X	X			X	X		Teachers Exploring Diversity (TED) Program gets the student in the classroom at the freshman level to assist teachers, tutor students, and occasionally teach students. The student is able to experience early the problems and needs of the classroom so that he can utilize what he learns on campus.	Edward R. Braxton, Director, TED Program
* Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	X	X	X	X	X			In addition to programs for handicapped children, Ohio State has a Freshman Early Experience Program, which like the program at Kent State, gets the student in the classroom in the early stages of his college career to determine if this is the career he will follow.	Thomas Stevens, Chairman, Faculty for Exceptional Children
OREGON									
University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon	X	X			X			The program this university offers for disadvantaged youths is primarily on the graduate level for teacher educators. However, on the under-graduate level, the elementary education majors are required to take a course entitled "Problems of Minorities in Schools."	Ernest Y. Flores, Ed.D, Assistant Professor of Education

* Council site-visit (November, 1974)

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
PENNSYLVANIA									
University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania		X			X			Although this university has no specific program designed for preparing inner city teachers, the location of the university in an inner city area, in effect, gives these students the practice teaching in this area. The teacher preparation program works very closely with the inner city schools in their area.	Allan Glatthorn, Director of Teacher Preparation
West Chester State College	X				X			The undergraduate program for teacher education at this college includes an early-childhood urban program. This program is the Cognitively Oriented Urban Pre-Kindergarten Program, specifically aimed at the 2-5 age group. (PRIDE PROJECT)	Paul Raffensperger, Assistant Director Educational Development Center
TEXAS									
West Texas State University Canyon, Texas	X		X	X	X			Each of the categories listed are included in the curriculum for special education at this university. As a special education major, a student is free to choose any of these areas for his concentration.	Wilma Jo Bush, Ed.D.

	LEVEL OF PROGRAMS		TYPE OF PROGRAMS						
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	UNDERGRAD.	GRADUATE	SPECIAL ED./	BIL./	URBAN/	RURAL/	N&D.	NOTES ON PROGRAM	FOR FURTHER INFO. CONTACT
TEXAS (Cont'd)									
Texas Woman's University Denton, Texas	X	X	X	X	X			This university is under contract with the Dallas School District to provide educational services to the District's schools for its bilingual students. The college program combines two years of practice teaching experience in the Dallas schools with the modified course work. Master's degrees are offered in five areas of special education. Doctor's degrees are offered in early childhood education with a minor in teaching the disadvantaged and in special education. A master's program in bilingual education is in preparation.	Howard Stone, Ed. D Chairman, Department of Curriculum and Instruction and/or Ernest Watkins, Ph.D. Chairman, Department of Special Education

STATE LEGISLATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED--1975

Appendix B

STATE	Type of Mandation	Compliance Date	Ages of Eligibility	Categories not Included	Protection of Due Process	Provisions for Mainstreaming	No. Receiving Services	Funding Level
ALABAMA	Full Planning and Program	1977	6-21	Profoundly Retarded	no policy	Statute		
ALASKA	Full Program	1974	3-19		Statute	Regulations	12,000	$9.5 million
ARIZONA	Selective Planning and Program	9/76	5-21	Emotionally Handicapped	no policy	Statute	29,221	$16 million
ARKANSAS	Full Planning and Program	1979-80	5-21		Statute and Regulations	Statute and Regulations	16,430	$3.5 million
CALIFORNIA	Selective		3-21	Educationally Handicapped Emothionally Disturbed Learning Disabled	Statute	no policy	313,900	$220 million
COLORADO	Full Planning and Program	7/1/76	5-21		Statute and Regulations	no policy	42,192	$14 million
CONNECTICUT	Full Planning and Program	7/67	3-21		Statute and Regulations	Policy	65,000	$31 million
DELAWARE	Full Programing "Wherever Possible"		4-21		Regulations	Regulations	13,230	$12.9 million
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Full Program (Court Order)	1972	from age 6		no policy	no policy		
FLORIDA	Full Program	1974	3-no limit (13 years guaranteed)		Statute and Regulations	Statute	146,400	$134 million
GEORGIA	Full Planning and Program	1975-76	3-20	Profoundly Retarded	Regulations	no policy		$71 million
HAWAII	Full Program		5-20		no policy	no policy		

STATE LEGISLATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED--1975

STATE	Type of Mandation	Compliance Date	Ages of Eligibility	Categories not Included	Protection of Due Process	Provisions for Mainstreaming	No. Receiving Services	Funding Level
IDAHO	Full Program		6-21		Regulations	Regulations	10,764	$9.5 million
ILLINOIS	Full Program	7/1/69	3-21		Regulations	Regulations	233,363	$122 million
INDIANA	Full Planning and Program	1973	6-18		Regulations	no policy	72,600	$17.5 million
IOWA	Full Program "If reasonably possible"	1979	birth-21		Statute	Statute	43,215	$7.4 million
KANSAS	Full Planning and Program	1979	birth-21		Statute	no policy	29,656	$6.1 million
KENTUCKY	Planning and Programming by Petition (TMR Only)		6-21	Other than Trainable Mentally Retarded	no policy	no policy		
LOUISIANA	Selective MR Orleans Parish (Court Order)	1973	3-21	Other than Mentally Retarded	Statute	Regulations	75,194	$31 million
	Full Program	1973-74	3-21					
MAINE	Full Planning and Program	1977	5-20		Statute and Regulations	Statute and Regulations	19,609	$6.5 million
MARYLAND	Full Planning and Program	1980	birth-25		Regulations	Regulations	72,528	$44 million
MASSACHUSETTS	Full Planning and Program	9/1/74	3-21		Statute and Regulations	Statute and Regulations	75,500	$32 million
MICHIGAN	Full Planning and Program	1974	birth-25		Regulations	Regulations	164,168	$90 million
MINNESOTA	Full Program	7/2/72	5-21(Retarded) 4-21(others)		Statute	no policy	80,000	$32 million

STATE LEGISLATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED--1975

STATE	Type of Mandation	Compliance Date	Ages of Eligibility	Categories not Included	Protection of Due Process	Provisions for Mainstreaming	No. Receiving Services	Funding Level
MISSISSIPPI	Permissive		birth-20		no policy	no policy	20,927	$7.1 million
MISSOURI	Full Planning and Program		5-21		Statute and Regulations	Statute and Regulations	149,143	$28 million
MONTANA	Full Program	7/1/79	6-21		no policy	no policy	8,554	$14 million
NEBRASKA	Full Planning and Program	10/1/76	5-18		Statute and Regulations	no policy	28,891	$8.6 million
NEVADA	Full Program	9/1/80	5-18		Statute and Regualtions	no policy		$6 million
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Full Program	1980	birth-21		Statute	Statute	8,120	$1.3 million
NEW JERSEY	Full Program		5-20		no policy	Regulations		
NEW MEXICO	Full Planning and Program	1976-77	6-21		Regulations	Regulations	10,511	$8 million
NEW YORK	Full Program (Court Order:NYC)	1973	5-21	Profoundly Retarded	no policy	no policy	236,517	
NORTH CAROLINA	Full Planning and Program	1982	birth to adulthood		Statute	no policy	117,381	$48 million
NORTH DAKOTA	Full Planning and Program	7/1/80	birth-21		Regulations	Regulations	10,000	$7.2 million biennium
OHIO	Selective Petition (8 or more crippled or EMR in district)		from age 5	Other than EMR or crippled	no policy	Policy	191,430	$90 million
	Selective Planning	1973	6-18	TMR or Profoundly Retarded				
OKLAHOMA	Full Program	9/1/70	4-21 2-21(blind and deaf)		Regulations	Regualtions	65,389	$9.7 million

STATE LEGISLATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED--1975

STATE	Type of Mandation	Compliance Date	Ages of Eligibility	Categories not Included	Protection of Due Process	Provisions for Mainstreaming	No. Receiving Services	Funding Level
OREGON	Full Program		EMR 6-21 Others birth-21		no policy	no policy		
PENNSYLVANIA	Selective MR	9/72	4-21	Other than MR	Regulations	Policy	205,000	$206, million
	Full Planning and Program	1956	6-21 Public Schools 0-21 Private Schools		no policy			
RHODE ISLAND	Full Program	1964	3-21		no policy	no policy		
SOUTH CAROLINA	Full Planning and Program	1977	6-21		no policy	Policy	53,550	$16 million
SOUTH DAKOTA	Full Program		birth-21		Regulations	Regulations	11,900	$350,000
TENNESSEE	Full Planning and Program	1975	4-21		Statute	Statute and Regulations	50,595	$25 million
TEXAS	Full Program	1976-77	3-21		Regulations	Regulations	300,000	$240 million
UTAH	Full Program		6-18		no policy	no policy		
VERMONT	Full Program		birth-21		Regulations	Regulations	6,500	$5.1 million
VIRGINIA	Full Program		2-21		no policy	Regulations	47,524	$12 million
WASHINGTON	Full Program		6-21		Regulations	Regulations		$42 million
WEST VIRGINIA	Full Program	1974	5-23		no policy	no policy	25,883	$4.6 million
WISCONSIN	Full Planning and Program	7/1/76	3-21	Gifted	Statute	Statute and Regulations	58,596	$67 million biennium
WYOMING	Full Program	9/77	6-21		Statute	Regulations	12,000	$5.2 million

COURT CASES

Lau v. Nichols

The Lau decision was decided by the Supreme Court in January 1974.

The major issue in this case was whether or not the San Francisco Unified School District had violated Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as other applicable laws.

The basic facts were that 2,856 students of Chinese ancestry did not speak English. Nearly 1,000 of these students were given supplemental courses in English while the remaining 1,800 received no training at all. Lau, representing these non-English speaking students brought class suit against the school district officials.

The Supreme Court, in granting the petition for certiorari, stated that:

> "since basic skills in English serve as a base to subjects taught in public schools, the 1,800 students are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful."

The Petitioner requested that the school board of education be directed to use its expertise to solve the problem and rectify the situation. The District Court denied such a relief, and the Court of Appeals affirmed the lower court decision. It was the opinion of the Supreme Court that the "question of public importance had been presented and the petition was granted."

On January 24, 1974, the final decision was handed down by the Supreme Court reversing the lower court's ruling. The public school system was mandated to provide bilingual instruction to students whose dominant language was other than English. But, just providing the same type of education to all students did not satisfy the law when some pupils were "effectively foreclosed from any meaning education," by language deficiencies.

The San Francisco School District was directed to develop programs which would help non-English speaking children so they would have an opportunity to a meaningful education. The decision, however, inherently implied that the words "language deficiency," referred only to the lack of proficiency in English and to no other deficiencies.

The Court did not mandate any specifications as to the remedy of programs to be developed nor to the type of plan to be implemented to justify the situation. Referring to the 1970 DHEW guidelines, the court stated:

> "where inability to speak and understand the English language excluded national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational programs offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students."

Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools

The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals ordered the Portales School District, Portales, New Mexico, to provide bilingual programs for Spanish surnamed children enrolled in their schools. Similar to the Lau decision, the court ruled that the constitutional rights of these students had been violated by providing them the same educational programs as that of Anglo students.

During 1971-72 approximately 34 percent of the students enrolled in the Portales Elementary Schools were Spanish surnamed. Another 29 percent were enrolled in the junior high schools and 12 percent in the high schools. As these students advanced to higher grades, a disproportionate number of them dropped out of school and lawyers for these students were able to provide undisputable evidence to explain the phenomenon.

The court declined to involve the 14th Amendment in view of the previous Supreme Court decision in the Lau case, stating "... we need not decide the equal protection issue." Because of the similarities between the two cases, the court found the school board in non-compliance with Section 601 of the Title VI, Civil Rights Act. As in the Lau case, since all public schools must be conducted in English, the Court concluded that the Portales school district had failed to institute a program which would rectify language deficiencies allowing non-English speaking children from receiving a meaningful education. Affirming the district court's plan, the court again referred to the Lau decision and stated that "numbers are at the heart of this case and only when a substantial group is deprived of a meaningful education will a Title VI violation exist."

Keyes v. School District No. 1

The Keyes decision was decided in April 1974 by the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. Their primary concern was ordering the Denver Public Schools to adopt an equitable and feasible plan for desegregation. As part of the plan, the Court urged the school district to adopt the plan prepared by Dr. Jose Cardenas which included the use of bilingual and bicultural programs.

In the context of ordering desegregation as a tool for providing all children an opportunity for an education, the Court stressed the fact that the Denver schools must be responsive to the needs of minority Chicano and Black students as well as those of the Anglo students.

Aspira v. Board of Education of the City of New York, et al

In August 1974 a decree was signed by the school board in the Federal Court, stating that the school board had agreed to work with Puerto Rican groups to implement a bilingual education program for these Spanish speaking students. The decision in this case was closely relate to the Lau decision in which non-English speaking students had not been provided educational services which would allow them to effectively participate and learn. The consent decree called for a systematic identification and classification of Spanish speaking and Spanish surnamed students who could learn more effectively in Spanish in terms of reading, speaking, writing, and comprehension ability in English and Spanish. The decree stressed that "students receiving instruction would spend maximum time with other children in order to avoid isolation and segregation from their peers."

Last winter bilingual programs were piloted in schools in New York and a full program is mandated to begin by September 1975 for students needing such programs.

Raising the question of adequate staffing was another point of concern and it was stated that "faculty in the bilingual program 'shall be' fluent in written and spoken Spanish and English as well as in educational techniques."

Serrano v. Priest

This case involved Serrano challenging the California's school finance system based on charge that its heavy reliance on local property taxes made the quality of a child's education a product of the wealth (or poverty) of that community. The trial court ruled agsinst the plaintiff and an appeal was taken to the State Supreme Court which remanded the case to the trial court. The State Supreme Court did, however, hold that education was a fundamental right and that if the facts were as stated by the plaintiff, the state system of school finance had violated these rights under the state constitution. Although the trial court decision is still pending, the case has already resulted in further equalization of state's school support system.

Diana v. State Board of Education

In February 1970 the Diana case involved student placement practices and resulted in a consent judgment directing the State of California to test all children whose primary home language is other than English. The judgment also required the retesting of all linguistically and culturally distinct children who had currently been placed in educable mentally retarded (EMR) classes.

Court Case on Appeal

Moreles v. Shannon

On February 13, 1973, the court ruled that Chicanos were not entitled to different instruction and it further ruled that segregation was not a discriminatory action because this was a pedagogic rather than a legal issue. The case is still on appeal in the administrative HEW proceedings.

STATE-BY-STATE SURVEY OF BILINGUAL LEGISLATION

STATE	Funding Level	No. of Programs	No. Served	Notes on the Programs	For Further Information
ALABAMA	No Legislation				
ALASKA	$566,200			Each state-operated school with 15 or more students whose dominant language is other than English, must provide bilingual instruction. Schools apply directly to the legislature for funds.	
ARIZONA	$700,000	33 districts	14,000	HB 2208 allows districts to provide bilingual education to children K-8 who have difficulty writing, speaking or understanding English. Funding provided K-4	Henry Arredondo Coordinator for Bilingual Education State Department of Education Phoenix, Arizona (602) 271-3205
ARKANSAS	No Legislation				
CALIFORNIA	$4 million	69 programs		Governor vetoed a $4 million expansion program in December, 1974. A new program of Bilingual teacher training is being set up with $4 million over the next five years	Gilbert Martinez Director, Bilingual Education State Department of Education 721 Capitol Mall Sacramento, California (916) 445-2872
COLORADO	none	10 programs 23 districts	1,300 urban 2,500 rural	The State Legislature passed an enabling act allowing instruction in languages other than English, but no funds were appropriated.	Bernie Martinez Consultant, Community Services State Office Building Denver, Colorado (303) 892-2234
CONNECTICUT	none	11 communities	4,000 urban	The State Legislature passed an enabling act allowing instruction in languages other than English, but no funds were appropriated. There are 274 teachers currently involved with bilingual/bicultural programs.	Kenneth Lester Consultant, ESOL and Bilingual State Department of Education Hartford, Connecticut (203) 566-4424
DELAWARE	none			A state law remains on the books (c.1920) that requires all classes to be taught in English. This law is not enforced and teachers may teach in another language if they wish	Robert Zaetta Coordinator of Bilingual Ed. Department of Public Instruction Dover, Delaware

STATE	Funding Level	No. of Programs	No. Served	Notes on the Programs	For Further Information
FLORIDA	none			Many students receive bilingual/bicultural instruction through local programs, such as in the Dade County schools	
GEORGIA	No Legislation				
HAWAII	No Legislation				
IDAHO	No Legislation			State law provides that a local district may pass a levy to provide migrant/bilingual programs, if they so desire.	
ILLINOIS	$8 million	144 programs	25,000 students	HB 1223 has made bilingual education mandatory by July 1, 1976, for any school with 20 or more limited English speaking children of the same language.	H. Ned Seelye, Director Bilingual Education 188 W. Randolph Street Chicago, Illinois (312) 793-3850
INDIANA	No Legislation			A study group in the Governor's Office is currently undertaking a needs assessment survey.	
IOWA	Line item in Migrant Budget				
KANSAS	none			The State Legislature has amended the state law to allow for bilingual instruction at the elementary level, with the approval of the State Board of Education.	Vincente Serrano Coordinator of Migant Programs State Department of Education 120 East Tenth Street Topeka, Kansas
KENTUCKY	No Legislatio				
LOUISIANA	$1.3 million	225 programs 36 counties		French may be used as a second language for instruction in elementary grades to enhance communication skills and career awareness on an international level.	Homer Dyess, Coordinator Foreign Languages and Bilingual State Department of Education P.O. Box 44064 Baton Rouge, Louisiana (504) 389-6486

STATE	Funding Level	No. of Programs	No. Served	Notes on the Programs	For Further Information
MAINE	none			Schools may provide up to five years of bilingual education.	
MARYLAND	none			The last Legislature turned down a bill providing funds for bilingual education. There is no law that prohibits the use of other languages.	Ann Beusch, Specialist Foreign Languages and Bilingual State Department of Education P.O. Box 8717 Balt-Wash International Airport Baltimore, Maryland
MASSACHUSETTS	$4 million	43 districts	10,000 urban	Districts with 20 or more students in one language classification must provide a bilingual education program.	Ernest Mazzone, Director Transitional Bilingual Education State Department of Education Boston, Massachusetts
MICHIGAN	$300,000	4-6 districts		State law mandates that schools having more than 20 students in the same language classification must be provided bilingual instruction K-12, with local funds. State grants are made available for pilot training programs only.	Robert Trezise, Coordinator Communication Skills State Department of Education P.O. Box 420 Lansing, Michigan (517) 373-1484
MINNESOTA	Legislation is pending at time of publication				
MISSISSIPPI	No Legislation				
MISSOURI	No Legislation				
MONTANA	none			The state recognizes the distinct and unique cultural heritage of the American Indians and is committed in its educational goals to the preservation of their cultural integrity.	Dean Lindahl, Supervisor ESEA, Title I State Department of Education Helena, Montana
NEBRASKA	No Legislation			State law mandates English only (not enforced)	
NEVADA	No Legislation			St. Constitution was amended to allow instruction in languages other than English.	

STATE	Funding Level	No. of Programs	No. Served	Notes on the Programs	For Further Information
NEW HAMPSHIRE	none			St. Constitution was amended to allow instruction in languages other than English. Bilingual and bicultural programs may be sanctioned by the State Board of Education.	
NEW JERSEY	none	approx. 50 districts by 9/75		The Governor signed a new bilingual education law in January, 1975. Districts with more than 20 students in the same language classification must provide instruction in both languages. Programs will start Sept.,1975.	Diego Castellanos, Acting Director Bilingual Education State Department of Education 225 West State Street Trenton, New Jersey (609) 292-8616
NEW MEXICO	$1 million	66 districts 179 programs	16,000	Legislation provides bilingual education for students with language problems, especially in the lower grades.	Jose Griego Special Consultant, Bilingual Ed. State Department of Education Santa Fe, New Mexico (505) 827-5391
NEW YORK	$1.5 million	44 programs (Title VII included)	20 to 1000 per program	Recent legislation has extended the use of bilingual instruction to all grade levels.	Maria Romirez Director, Bilingual Education State Department of Education Albany, New York
NORTH CAROLINA	No Legislation				
NORTH DAKOTA	No Legislation				
OHIO	No Legislation				
OKLAHOMA	No Legislation				
OREGON	none			Instruction may be conducted in more than one language in order that pupils whose native language is other than English can develop bilingual skills to make an early and effective transition to English and benefit from increase educational opportunities.	Gilbert Anzaldua Director, Compesatory Education State Department of Education 942 Lancaster Drive, NE Salem, Oregon

STATE	Funding Level	No. of Programs	No. Served	Notes on the Programs	For Further Information
PENNSYLVANIA	none	110 districts	13,000	The Secretary of Education has mandated that all districts with students having dominant languages other than English, must provide either bilingual education or English as a Second Language programs.	Fannetta Gordon Senior Advisor for Foreign Languages Department of Curriculum State Department of Education Harisburg, Pennsylvania
RHODE ISLAND	No Legislation				
SOUTH CAROLINA	No Legislation				
SOUTH DAKOTA	No Legislation				
TENNESSEE	No Legislation				
TEXAS	$2.7 million	212 programs (first grade)	27,000	Legislation mandates bilingual education in any school having 20 or more students in the same language classification. Not reflected in the funding level is an appropriation for new bilingual text books (approx. $2 million)	Dr. Severo Comez Associate Commissioner of Education Texas Education Agency 201 East 11th Street Austin, Texas
UTAH	$600,000	1 program		Bilingual education is a recent development and is optional to the districts. This year only one program was undertaken, however more are pending for next year.	Elliott Howe Coordinator, Title I, ESEA 136 East South Temple Salt Lake City, Utah (801) 328-5061
VERMONT	No Legislation				
VIRGINIA	No Legislation				
WASHINGTON	$597,192	6 rural 7 urban	1,581 rural 807 urban	There is no state legislation providing bilingual/bicultural programs. These programs are a high priority category of the state's compensatory eduation program; Urban, Rural, Recial, Disadvantaged Educational Program (URRD)	Walt Barbee Supervisor, URRD Programs Old Capitol Building Olympia, Washington
WEST VIRGINIA	No Legislatio				
WISCONSIN	No Legislatio				
WYOMING	No Legislatio				

Appendix E

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10, As Amended
Title I, Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children

State Programs for Migratory Children
Total Amount Available for Fiscal Year 1975

State	Total Amount Available	Previous Amount Available 1974 Allocations	Additional Amount Available
TOTALS	$91,953,160	$78,331,437	$13,621,723
Alabama	696,609	694,053	2,556
Alaska	-	-	-
Arizona	2,060,801	2,053,240	7,561
Arkansas	1,508,096	733,364	774,732
California	17,007,082	9,832,415	7,174,667
Colorado	1,492,085	1,486,611	5,474
Connecticut	711,598	708,987	2,611
Delaware	308,703	307,570	1,133
Florida	10,917,165	10,877,110	40,055
Georgia	551,946	524,606	27,340
Hawaii	-	-	-
Idaho	1,636,009	887,448	748,561
Illinois	709,889	707,285	2,604
Indiana	714,750	712,127	2,623
Iowa	98,987	98,624	363
Kansas	633,116	630,793	2,323
Kentucky	87,076	86,756	320
Louisiana	478,465	476,710	1,755
Maine	237,511	63,260	174,251
Maryland	930,781	927,366	3,415
Massachusetts	603,838	285,747	318,091
Michigan	4,382,620	4,224,724	157,896
Minnesota	444,765	439,641	5,124
Mississippi	1,019,062	1,015,323	3,739
Missouri	644,243	453,664	190,579
Montana	854,435	851,300	3,135
Nebraska	283,451	282,411	1,040
Nevada	38,096	37,956	140
New Hampshire	23,583	23,497	86
New Jersey	2,232,249	2,224,058	8,191

State	Total Amount Available	Previous Amount Available 1974 Allocations	Additional Amount Available
New Mexico	2,377,140	992,279	1,384,861
New York	2,871,632	2,861,096	10,536
North Carolina	1,671,826	1,508,299	163,527
North Dakota	746,949	744,209	2,740
Ohio	1,485,283	1,479,833	5,450
Oklahoma	757,380	754,601	2,779
Oregon	1,905,557	1,898,566	6,991
Pennsylvania	618,364	616,096	2,268
Rhode Island	3,036	3,025	11
South Carolina	630,848	628,533	2,315
South Dakota	36,735	36,600	135
Tennessee	315,651	314,493	1,158
Texas	19,034,289	18,964,452	69,837
Utah	258,507	257,558	949
Vermont	10,732	6,326	4,406
Virginia	762,822	760,024	2,798
Washington	3,348,843	2,044,507	1,304,336
West Virginia	204,992	204,240	752
Wisconsin	718,853	517,041	201,812
Wyoming	275,123	193,013	82,110
Outlying Areas	195,867	-	195,867
Puerto Rico	515,720	-	515,720
Reserved	1,900,000	1,900,000	-

APPENDIX F

-- NUMBER AND RATE OF DELINQUENCY CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, UNITED STATES, 1957-1972 [1]

Year	Delinquency cases a/	Child population 10 through 17 yrs. of age (in thousands)	Rate b/
1957........	440,000	22,173	19.8
1958........	470,000	23,443	20.0
1959........	483,000	24,607	19.6
1960........	510,000	25,368	20.1
1961........	503,000	26,056	19.3
1962........	555,000	26,989	20.6
1963........	601,000	28,056	21.4
1964........	686,000	29,244	23.5
1965........	697,000	29,536	23.6
1966........	745,000	30,124	24.7
1967........	811,000	30,837	26.3
1968........	900,000	31,566	28.5
1969........	988,500	32,157	30.7
1970........	1,052,000	32,614	32.3
1971........	1,125,000	32,969	34.1
1972........	1,112,500	33,120	33.6

a/ Data for 1957-1969 estimated from the national sample of juvenile courts. Data for 1970, 1971 and 1972 estimated from all courts reporting whose jurisdictions included more than three-fourths of the population of the U.S.

b/ Based on the number of delinquency cases per 1,000 U.S. child population 10 through 17 years of age.

Table 6. -- NUMBER AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF DELINQUENCY CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, BY TYPE OF COURT, UNITED STATES, 1957-1972

Year	Urban		Semi-urban		Rural	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1957........	280,000	63	113,000	26	47,000	11
1958........	298,000	63	120,000	26	52,000	11
1959........	295,000	61	127,000	26	61,000	13
1960........	344,000	67	128,000	25	42,000	8
1961........	350,000	69	119,000	24	34,000	7
1962........	383,000	69	132,500	24	39,500	7
1963........	414,000	69	146,000	24	41,000	7
1964........	456,000	67	181,000	26	49,000	7
1965........	470,000	68	183,000	26	43,000	6
1966........	490,000	66	206,500	28	48,000	6
1967........	525,000	65	235,300	29	50,700	6
1968........	588,200	65	256,400	29	55,200	6
1969........	646,600	66	280,800	28	61,100	6
1970........	686,000	66	296,800	28	69,200	6
1971........	717,000	64	331,000	29	77,000	7
1972........	692,000	62	345,000	31	75,500	7

[1] Juvenile Court Statistics, 1972
Office of Human Development
Office of Youth Development

NUMBER AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF DELINQUENCY CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, BY MANNER OF HANDLING, UNITED STATES, 1957-1972

Year	Judicial		Nonjudicial	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1957...........	239,000	54	201,000	46
1958...........	237,000	50	233,000	50
1959...........	250,000	52	233,000	48
1960...........	258,000	50	256,000	50
1961...........	257,000	51	246,000	49
1962...........	285,000	51	270,000	49
1963...........	298,000	50	303,000	50
1964...........	333,000	49	353,000	51
1965...........	327,000	47	370,000	53
1966...........	357,000	48	387,000	52
1967...........	382,100	47	428,900	53
1968...........	425,400	47	474,400	53
1969...........	433,300	44	555,200	56
1970...........	472,000	45	580,000	55
1971...........	475,000	42	650,000	58
1972...........	461,300	41	651,200	59

Table 8. -- NUMBER AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF DELINQUENCY CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, BY SEX, UNITED STATES, 1957-1972

Year	Boys		Girls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1957...........	358,000	81	82,000	19
1958...........	383,000	81	87,000	19
1959...........	393,000	81	90,000	19
1960...........	415,000	81	99,000	19
1961...........	408,000	81	95,000	19
1962...........	450,000	81	104,500	19
1963...........	485,000	81	116,000	19
1964...........	555,000	81	131,000	19
1965...........	555,000	80	142,000	20
1966...........	593,000	80	152,000	20
1967...........	640,000	79	171,000	21
1968...........	708,000	79	191,000	21
1969...........	760,000	77	228,000	23
1970...........	799,500	76	252,000	24
1971...........	845,500	75	279,500	25
1972...........	827,500	74	285,000	26

APPENDIX G

Dependency and Neglect Cases[1]

NUMBER AND RATE OF DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, UNITED STATES, 1972 a/

Type of court	Number of cases	Rate per 1,000 child population b/			
		All courts	Age jurisdiction of court		
			Under 16	Under 17	Under 18 c/
Urban............	84,000	1.8	1.1	1.8	2.2
Semi-urban.......	41,000	2.9	2.3	2.1	3.3
Rural............	16,000	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.8

a/ Based on the data from 1,527 courts whose jurisdiction include more than two-thirds of the child population under 18 years of age.

b/ Calculated on basis of the 1970 child population at risk, that is, the child population under 16, for courts whose age jurisdiction is under 16, etc.

c/ A small number of courts having jurisdiction of children under 21 years of age are included here. The number of cases involved do not seriously affect the rates of the courts in this column.

Table 10. -- PERCENT CHANGE IN DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, UNITED STATES, 1971-1972 a/

Type of court	Total	Judicial	Nonjudicial
Total	+8	+4	+36
Urban................	-3	-6	+8
Semi-urban..........	+35	+21	+93
Rural...............	+18	+20	+3

a/ Based on data from 1,459 courts reporting both years, who jurisdiction includes about two-thirds of the child population under 18 years of age.

---

[1] Juvenile Court Statistics, 1972
Office of Human Development
Office of Youth Development

NUMBER AND RATE OF DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT CASES DISPOSED OF BY JUVENILE COURTS, UNITED STATES, 1946-1972

Year	Dependency and neglect	Child population under 18 yrs. of age (in thousands)	Rate b/
1946........	101,000	41,759	2.4
1947........	104,000	43,301	2.4
1948........	103,000	44,512	2.3
1949........	98,000	45,775	2.1
1950........	93,000	47,017	2.0
1951........	97,000	48,598	2.0
1952........	98,000	50,296	1.9
1953........	103,000	51,987	2.0
1954........	103,000	53,737	1.9
1955........	106,000	55,568	1.9
1956........	105,000	57,377	1.8
1957........	114,000	59,336	1.9
1958........	124,000	61,238	2.0
1959........	128,000	63,038	2.0
1960........	131,000	64,516	2.0
1961........	140,000	65,789	2.1
1962........	141,000	67,092	2.1
1963........	146,000	68,371	2.1
1964........	150,000	69,625	2.2
1965........	157,000	69,699	2.3
1966........	161,000	69,851	2.3
1967........	154,000	69,878	2.2
1968........	141,000	69,831	2.0
1969........	127,000	69,694	1.8
1970........	133,000	69,669	1.9
1971........	130,900	69,576	1.9
1972........	141,000	69,060	2.0

a/ Data for 1955-1972 estimated from courts serving about two-thirds of the child population under 18 years of age in the United States. Data prior to 1955 estimated by the Children's Bureau, based on reports from a smaller but comparable group of courts. Inclusion of estimates from Alaska and Hawaii beginning in 1960 does not materially affect trend.

b/ Based on dependency and neglect cases per 1,000 U.S. child population under 18 years of age.

FISCAL YEARS 1974 & 1975
FORMULA CHILDREN FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

	1970 Census	1974 Total	1975 Total	1974 AFDC	1975 AFDC
TOTALS	2,645,820	6,246,839	8,664,261	3,337,968	691,952
1. Alabama	95,984	105,370	275,319	6,424	-0-
2. Alaska	4,262	9,862	14,348	5,120	1,391
3. Arizona	29,328	50,292	86,383	18,850	51
4. Arkansas	52,247	54,245	156,758	452	-0-
5. California	214,413	752,195	712,390	510,487	86,123
6. Colorado	25,367	64,559	79,711	37,003	6,075
7. Connecticut	22,226	75,857	64,794	49,904	6,423
8. Delaware	5,556	12,189	18,501	5,354	23
9. District of Columbia	13,081	53,950	44,178	39,758	5,745
10. Florida	100,693	144,601	305,551	37,443	8
11. Georgia	93,139	142,022	297,516	45,389	-0-
12. Hawaii	7,229	23,289	25,599	15,630	5,690
13. Idaho	7,397	12,772	25,252	4,827	971
14. Illinois	103,789	416,063	397,602	299,258	82,157
15. Indiana	41,836	94,238	131,557	45,515	835
16. Iowa	22,459	52,711	77,788	27,315	3,116
17. Kansas	22,125	50,477	69,458	25,913	2,320
18. Kentucky	68,780	106,359	212,288	33,691	-0-
19. Louisiana	114,600	140,631	312,211	22,595	14
20. Maine	10,067	33,456	38,866	21,263	496
21. Maryland	43,120	116,189	128,503	65,902	2,588
22. Massachusetts	41,679	172,617	155,208	125,897	33,266
23. Michigan	83,713	317,428	311,549	224,340	80,560
24. Minnesota	31,885	82,665	118,582	45,638	14,404
25. Mississippi	98,695	100,232	263,368	-0-	-0-
26. Missouri	59,163	101,115	178,961	37,144	831
27. Montana	8,182	14,208	26,019	5,324	290
28. Nebraska	15,821	29,410	47,675	12,335	556
29. Nevada	3,964	6,865	11,508	2,280	4
30. New Hampshire	4,538	14,047	17,424	8,153	1,727
31. New Jersey	57,733	246,736	213,412	181,186	50,113
32. New Mexico	27,942	40,748	81,759	11,644	-0-
33. New York	194,566	805,631	779,971	563,867	205,710
34. North Carolina	99,224	129,658	317,127	26,087	23
35. North Dakota	8,065	13,566	29,134	4,731	1,016
36. Ohio	104,125	265,208	292,068	147,014	4,475
37. Oklahoma	37,316	66,348	126,963	26,299	1,041
38. Oregon	19,583	47,725	65,075	23,575	6,460
39. Pennsylvania	102,040	367,777	368,354	249,896	48,054
40. Rhode Island	8,805	28,028	29,161	18,196	3,696
41. South Carolina	71,844	81,935	209,080	8,086	-0-
42. South Dakota	10,763	18,739	36,753	6,716	1,425
43. Tennessee	81,832	85,254	247,910	-0-	-0-
44. Texas	192,639	282,817	645,142	81,854	-0-
45. Utah	9,638	26,746	34,848	15,636	2,760
46. Vermont	3,489	10,203	15,974	5,789	2,063
47. Virginia	67,779	127,205	221,252	54,062	206
48. Washington	29,722	91,654	99,226	56,491	13,300
49. West Virginia	35,484	61,934	109,129	23,542	-0-
50. Wisconsin	34,579	93,079	126,609	51,829	15,946
51. Wyoming	3,314	5,934	10,447	2,264	-0-

1974 & 1975 LEA Formula Children

	1974 Delinquent	1975 Delinquent	1974 Neglected	1975 Neglected
TOTALS	17,735	17,768	48,666	48,416
1. Alabama	101	82	756	686
2. Alaska	-0-	25	78	116
3. Arizona	284	236	202	315
4. Arkansas	67	8	636	625
5. California	5,340	5,821	2,607	3,269
6. Colorado	14	34	379	352
7. Connecticut	65	70	424	357
8. Delaware	-0-	-0-	49	-0-
9. District of Columbia	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
10. Florida	724	895	804	809
11. Georgia	14	49	1,218	1,118
12. Hawaii	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
13. Idaho	53	15	65	84
14. Illinois	284	323	3,180	2,883
15. Indiana	714	655	1,382	1,544
16. Iowa	50	21	184	174
17. Kansas	84	173	387	356
18. Kentucky	442	292	1,240	1,207
19. Louisiana	9	-0-	358	395
20. Maine	-0-	15	154	164
21. Maryland	105	115	323	347
22. Massachusetts	203	159	899	893
23. Michigan	1,505	1,220	1,035	1,216
24. Minnesota	347	459	472	399
25. Mississippi	32	32	438	506
26. Missouri	1,005	1,198	532	659
27. Montana	-0-	26	262	217
28. Nebraska	43	18	255	242
29. Nevada	-0-	-0-	177	224
30. New Hampshire	12	21	293	309
31. New Jersey	640	606	544	387
32. New Mexico	10	22	293	336
33. New York	1,790	1,389	7,497	8,219
34. North Carolina	-0-	-0-	2,168	2,113
35. North Dakota	36	36	77	68
36. Ohio	512	586	2,992	2,990
37. Oklahoma	243	137	1,135	1,166
38. Oregon	411	325	216	8
39. Pennsylvania	1,305	1,289	3,988	3,825
40. Rhode Island	-0-	-0-	191	170
41. South Carolina	-0-	13	756	816
42. South Dakota	-0-	49	710	722
43. Tennessee	90	-0-	1,587	807
44. Texas	265	363	4,178	4,052
45. Utah	111	140	79	72
46. Vermont	-0-	-0-	169	175
47. Virginia	-0-	-0-	1,173	610
48. Washington	360	456	943	1,069
49. West Virginia	67	51	343	361
50. Wisconsin	372	320	745	875
51. Wyoming	26	24	93	110

1974 & 1975 LEA Formula Children

	1974 Correctional	1975 Correctional	1974 Foster	1975 Foster
TOTALS	1,660	1,498	195,990	204,259
1. Alabama	-0-	-0-	2,105	2,405
2. Alaska	-0-	-0-	402	423
3. Arizona	-0-	-0-	1,628	1,767
4. Arkansas	-0-	-0-	843	990
5. California	-0-	-0-	19,348	21,412
6. Colorado	-0-	-0-	1,796	1,996
7. Connecticut	196	-0-	3,042	2,861
8. Delaware	-0-	-0-	1,230	1,106
9. District of Columbia	-0-	-0-	1,111	1,240
10. Florida	-0-	-0-	4,937	4,264
11. Georgia	-0-	-0-	2,262	2,478
12. Hawaii	-0-	-0-	430	444
13. Idaho	-0-	-0-	430	466
14. Illinois	-0-	-0-	9,552	9,928
15. Indiana	-0-	-0-	4,791	5,039
16. Iowa	-0-	-0-	2,703	2,477
17. Kansas	-0-	-0-	1,968	1,979
18. Kentucky	-0-	-0-	2,206	2,327
19. Louisiana	-0-	-0-	3,069	2,952
20. Maine	-0-	-0-	1,972	1,883
21. Maryland	-0-	81	6,666	8,421
22. Massachusetts	73	19	3,939	3,971
23. Michigan	-0-	-0-	6,836	8,068
24. Minnesota	-0--	-0-	4,323	4,384
25. Mississippi	-0-	-0-	1,067	1,151
26. Missouri	-0-	35	3,271	3,283
27. Montana	-0-	-0-	440	488
28. Nebraska	43	-0-	956	907
29. Nevada	49	-0-	395	322
30. New Hampshire	-0-	63	1,051	1,081
31. New Jersey	48	77	6,585	6,539
32. New Mexico	-0-	-0-	859	842
33. New York	1,277	1,200	36,634	37,051
34. North Carolina	-0-	-0-	2,179	2,446
35. North Dakota	-0-	-0-	657	660
36. Ohio	-0-	-0-	10,565	10,475
37. Oklahoma	-0-	-0-	1,355	2,071
38. Oregon	-0-	-0-	3,940	4,329
39. Pennsylvania	-0-	-0-	10,548	10,372
40. Rhode Island	-0-	-0-	836	81813
41. South Carolina	-0-	-0-	1,249	1,266
42. South Dakota	-0-	-0-	550	742
43. Tennessee	-0-	-0-	1,745	1,946
44. Texas	-0-	-0-	3,881	3,951
45. Utah	-0-	-0-	1,282	1,080
46. Vermont	-0-	-0-	756	674
47. Virginia	-0-	-0-	4,191	6,079
48. Washington	-0-	-0-	4,138	4,229
49. West Virginia	17	9	2,481	2,349
50. Wisconsin	-0-	-0-	5,554	5,573
51. Wyoming	-0-	-0-	237	259

APPENDIX I

Number of Children Counted for Entitlements for State Agencies Fiscal Year 1974

	Total	Handcapped	Juvenile Delinquents	Dependent and Neglected	Adult Correctional	Migratory
TOTALS	379,236	166,415	34,880	3,771	11,690	162,480
ALABAMA	3,419	1,368	430	-0-	85	1,536
ALASKA	1,944	1,835	109	-0-	-0-	-0-
ARIZONA	6,360	1,145	646	-0-	25	4,544
ARKANSAS	4,734	2,595	431	-0-	85	1,623
CALIFORNIA	29,646	4,375	3,127	-0-	384	21,760
COLORADO	6,953	3,323	340	-0-	-0-	3,290
CONNECTICUT	4,251	2,689	187	87	-0-	1,288
DELAWARE	2,203	1,296	303	-0-	-0-	604
FLORIDA	31,116	4,444	1,342	-0-	1,258	24,072
GEORGIA	4,312	1,687	1,048	-0-	416	1,161
HAWAII	588	500	47	41	-0-	-0-
IDAHO	2,571	424	129	-0-	54	1,964
ILLINOIS	13,504	10,734	1,113	237	-0-	1,420
INDIANA	7,231	4,631	610	-0-	414	1,576
IOWA	2,269	1,601	278	176	-0-	214
KANSAS	4,263	2,381	302	-0-	184	1,396
KENTUCKY	1,864	1,539	-0-	-0-	133	192
LOUISIANA	6,651	4,602	949	-0-	45	1,055
MAINE	1,626	1,156	279	24	27	140
MARYLAND	5,521	2,348	971	-0-	432	1,770
MASSACHUSETTS	8,150	7,040	325	-0-	160	625
MICHIGAN	18,902	9,224	558	27	898	8,195
MINNESOTA	3,030	1,254	590	-0-	353	833
MISSISSIPPI	3,948	1,068	540	-0-	93	2,247
MISSOURI	5,944	4,033	671	-0-	231	1,004
MONTANA	2,884	701	190	109	-0-	1,884
NEBRASKA	1,574	723	191	35	-0-	625
NEVADA	624	281	227	-0-	32	84
NEW HAMPSHIRE	985	751	182	-0-	-0-	52
NEW JERSEY	11,853	6,872	1,199	-0-	88	3,694
NEW MEXICO	3,317	825	296	-0-	-0-	2,196
NEW YORK	20,054	12,952	2,295	-0-	1,008	3,799
NORTH CAROLINA	10,439	4,619	1,671	-0-	811	3,338
NORTH DAKOTA	2,460	635	127	-0-	50	1,647
OHIO	16,720	11,131	1,804	285	225	3,275
OKLAHOMA	4,412	1,423	334	543	442	1,670
OREGON	6,919	2,544	465	-0-	150	3,760
PENNSYLVANIA	14,832	11,242	1,480	475	406	1,229
RHODE ISLAND	1,127	990	41	64	26	6

Number of Children Counted for Entitlements for SEA Fiscal Year 1975

	Juvenile Delinquents	Adult Correctional	Neglected	Migrant
TOTALS	32,055	13,182	3,886	219,792
Alabama	415	72		1,442
Alaska	102	9		
Arizona	442	20		4,572
Arkansas	424	278		4,716
California	2,503	456		43,173
Colorado	344	47		3,436
Connecticut	88	821	102	1,488
Delaware	141			335
Florida	1,176	865		29,421
Georgia	1,155	434		1,726
Hawaii	42	1		
Idaho	97	100		5,116
Illinois	902	219	76	1,207
Indiana	553	523	317	1,776
Iowa	266	120	176	129
Kansas	279	162		1,119
Kentucky	428	231		246
Louisiana	748	45		764
Maine	243	78	19	741
Maryland	713	435		402
Massachusetts	625	149		1,412
Michigan	514	812	27	3,753
Minnesota	470	204		458
Mississippi	565	126		2,580
Missouri	544	47		
Montana	198	3	108	602
Nebraska	171		33	621
Nevada	185	31		102
New Hampshire	192			
New Jersey	1,172	63		2,680
New Mexico	253			7,376
New York	2,644	1,008		
North Carolina	1,132	1,055		5,227
North Dakota	96	30		900
Ohio	2,134	16	279	2,891
Oklahoma	382	271	627	1,539
Oregon	837	170		
Pennsylvania	940	644	450	569
Rhode Island	45	15	52	1
South Carolina	576	207	180	957
South Dakota	63	32		27
Tennessee	1,103	415	497	394
Texas	1,652	616	626	
Utah	200	9		396
Vermont	129	6		28
Virginia	1,000	560		527
Washington	591	385		8,091
West Virginia	497	59	55	1,685
Wisconsin	688	148	59	640
Wyoming	94	27		
American Samoa	408			

Appendix J

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10, As Amended
Title I, Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children
Allotments for Fiscal Year 1975

	PART A								PART B—$14,000,000		PART C—$38,000,000		Total Administration	Grand Total
	Local Educational Agencies	Handicapped Children	Juvenile Delinquents	Adult Correctional Institutions	Neglected Children	Migrant[1] Children	Administration	Total Part A	Special Incentive	Administration	Special Grants	Administration		
TOTALS	1,587,168,967	87,863,520	18,062,691	6,734,295	2,023,763	91,953,160	19,311,687	1,813,118,083	13,861,386	138,614	37,623,761	376,239	19,826,540	1,876,000,000 1,865,118,083
ALABAMA	40,339,739	633,507	199,129	39,363		711,306	419,230	42,342,274			319,986	3,200	422,430	42,665,460
ALASKA	3,225,765	1,464,514	86,993	4,408			145,777	4,927,457	340,716	3,407	81,626	816	150,000	5,354,022
ARIZONA	13,383,262	530,238	299,156	11,577		2,104,281	163,285	16,491,799			258,748	2,587	165,872	16,753,134
ARKANSAS	22,990,111	1,201,718	199,592	90,775		1,539,915	260,221	26,282,332			208,408	2,084	262,305	26,492,824
CALIFORNIA	128,062,203	2,026,019	1,448,082	183,421		17,365,908	1,490,856	150,576,489			4,514,851	45,149	1,536,005	155,136,489
COLORADO	13,504,183	1,538,848	157,451	17,808		1,523,566	167,419	16,909,275	77,080	771	425,280	4,253	172,443	17,416,659
CONNECTICUT	13,831,739	1,516,973	105,494	427,046	49,080	726,612	166,569	16,823,513	51,653	517	750,125	7,501	174,587	17,633,309
DELAWARE	3,995,756	727,984	158,130			315,216	148,913	5,345,999	108,743	1,087			150,000	5,455,829
FLORIDA	47,884,074	2,057,972	621,467	582,567		11,147,502	622,936	62,916,518			916,894	9,169	632,105	63,842,581
GEORGIA	44,014,035	781,233	485,318	192,645		563,591	460,36	46,497,190			485,009	4,850	465,218	46,987,049
HAWAII	4,692,480	261,985	23,624	410	20,608		147,994	5,147,101			200,570	2,006	150,000	5,349,677
IDAHO	3,693,052	193,109	59,739	25,007		1,670,527	149,350	5,790,784			65,039	650	150,000	5,856,473
ILLINOIS	84,060,765	5,479,386	568,153	103,530	120,981	724,867	910,577	91,968,259			3,551,694	35,517	946,094	95,555,470
INDIANA	21,072,822	2,144,570	282,485	191,719	179,679	729,830	246,011	24,847,116			399,981	4,000	250,011	25,251,097
IOWA	14,661,224	756,184	131,305	47,990	83,128	101,076	157,809	15,938,716	35,404	354	235,152	2,352	160,515	16,211,978
KANSAS	11,747,773	1,102,617	139,853	85,209		646,474	147,465	13,869,391			253,470	2,535	150,000	14,125,396
KENTUCKY	31,939,341	712,696	139,755	75,428		88,913	329,561	33,285,694			282,678	2,827	332,388	33,571,199
LOUISIANA	47,145,448	2,131,141	439,472	20,839		488,560	502,255	50,727,715	752,469	7,525	567,212	5,762	515,452	52,060,593
MAINE	5,727,207	537,527	129,202	25,529	11,114	242,522	147,009	6,820,110	237,589	2,376	61,452	615	150,000	7,122,142
MARYLAND	26,786,951	1,361,101	505,279	231,967		950,419	298,357	30,134,074	156,745	1,567	852,314	8,523	308,447	31,153,223
MASSACHUSETTS	30,292,790	3,627,027	272,919	74,970		616,578	348,843	35,233,127	219,440	2,194	1,524,977	15,250	366,287	36,994,988
MICHIGAN	63,845,083	5,799,116	294,814	474,449	14,265	4,475,087	749,028	75,651,842	2,079,208	20,792	2,581,044	25,810	795,630	80,358,696
MINNESOTA	25,155,468	678,289	319,131	190,938		454,149	267,980	27,065,955	1,739,156	17,392	556,894	5,569	290,941	29,384,966
MISSISSIPPI	38,543,845	495,173	250,069	43,067		1,040,563	403,727	40,776,444			272,438	2,724	406,451	41,051,606
MISSOURI	28,643,389	1,869,958	310,733	106,974		657,836	315,889	31,904,779			552,240	5,522	321,411	32,462,521
MONTANA	4,500,975	324,626	87,987	1,158	50,477	872,462	147,880	5,985,565	142,309	1,423	69,651	697	150,000	6,199,645
NEBRASKA	8,337,465	334,814	88,450		16,208	289,431	148,659	9,215,027			134,126	1,341	150,000	9,350,494
NEVADA	1,951,085	142,107	105,121	14,819		38,900	149,447	2,401,479			55,268	553	150,000	2,457,300
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,743,951	377,762	84,282			24,081	149,350	3,379,426			64,963	650	150,000	3,445,039
NEW JERSEY	47,673,165	4,240,298	739,831	54,300		2,279,346	549,869	55,536,809	1,092,433	10,924	2,604,429	26,044	586,837	59,270,639
NEW MEXICO	12,028,757	382,050	137,075			2,427,294	149,752	15,124,928	691,951	6,920	151,935	1,519	158,191	15,977,253

NEW YORK	191,866,701	10,006,146	1,903,367	778,015		2,932,220	2,074,864	209,561,313	2,079,208	20,792	4,514,851	45,149	2,140,805	216,221,313
NORTH CAROLINA	47,964,045	2,218,034	773,823	375,566		1,707,099	530,386	53,568,953			512,301	5,123	535,509	54,086,377
NORTH DAKOTA	4,377,310	294,526	58,812	23,154		762,709	149,620	5,666,131			38,028	380	150,000	5,704,539
OHIO	50,025,141	5,154,655	835,414	104,195	131,981	1,516,620	577,680	58,345,686			1,347,180	13,472	591,152	59,706,338
OKLAHOMA	18,586,708	680,081	154,672	204,686	251,458	773,360	206,510	20,857,475			227,435	2,274	208,784	21,087,184
OREGON	13,065,339	1,392,165	376,014	77,624		1,945,762	168,569	17,025,473	389,098	3,891	333,883	3,339	175,799	17,755,684
PENNSYLVANIA	78,521,619	5,809,550	760,365	208,587	244,036	631,411	861,755	87,037,223	1,359,037	13,590	2,326,597	23,266	898,611	90,759,713
RHODE ISLAND	5,852,170	511,454	21,181	13,432	33,064	3,100	147,580	6,581,981			241,984	2,420	150,000	6,826,385
SOUTH CAROLINA	30,882,029	1,214,222	301,472	378,345	88,450	644,158	335,087	33,843,763			283,775	2,838	337,925	34,130,376
SOUTH DAKOTA	5,677,625	333,425	51,866	10,566		36,510	149,221	6,260,213			77,909	779	150,000	6,338,901
TENNESSEE	36,592,586	878,018	459,385	135,510	238,954	322,311	386,268	[1]39,013,032			371,795	3,718	389,986	39,388,545
TEXAS	94,397,530	5,534,851	966,469	207,001	316,754	19,435,887	1,208,585	122,067,077			1,480,858	14,809	1,223,394	123,562,744
UTAH	5,089,990	400,110	106,974	7,873		263,961	146,730	6,015,638	171,591	1,716	155,352	1,554	150,000	6,345,851
VERMONT	2,793,655	741,765	63,443	4,168		10,958	146,081	3,760,070	366,674	3,667	25,186	252	150,000	4,155,849
VIRGINIA	35,346,213	1,226,086	549,688	398,257		778,917	382,992	38,682,153			584,352	5,844	388,836	29,272,349
WASHINGTON	18,740,912	1,479,683	367,179	162,713		3,419,499	241,700	24,411,686	429,251	4,293	659,910	6,599	252,592	25,511,739
WEST VIRGINIA	16,348,525	470,963	238,491	30,101	25,470	209,317	173,229	17,496,096			183,227	1,832	175,061	17,681,155
WISCONSIN	24,647,752	2,155,588	432,661	73,568	43,729	734,020	280,873	28,368,191	1,144,005	11,440	496,449	4,964	297,277	30,025,049
WYOMING	2,049,328	222,033	49,957	11,852		280,928	147,722	2,761,820	197,626	1,976	30,240	302	150,000	2,991,964
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	9,670,073	1,067,274	262,746		104,327		142,660	11,247,080			734,015	7,340	150,000	11,988,435
AMERICAN SAMOA	383,440						25,000	408,440					25,000	408,440
GUAM	1,015,694	70,896					25,000	1,111,590					25,000	1,111,590
PUERTO RICO	27,366,926	571,453	442,714	211,169		526,601	291,189	29,410,052					291,189	29,410,052
TRUST TERRITORY	1,219,150						25,000	1,244,150					25,000	1,244,150
VIRGIN ISLAND	647,470		15,907				25,000	688,377					25,000	688,377
Dept. of Interior	17,567,233							17,567,233						17,567,233
Outlying Areas						200,000		200,000						200,000
Evaluation and Studies														9,850,000
Undistributed														1,031,917

[1] $1.9 million of this amount reserved for the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

Appendix K

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-10, As Amended
Title 1, Assistance for Educationally Deprived Children
Allotments for Fiscal Year 1974

	PART A								PART B	PART C			GRAND TOTAL	
	Local Educational Agencies	Handicapped Children (State Agencies)	Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions (State Agencies)	Delinquents in Correctional Institutions (State Agencies)	Neglected Children in Institutons (State Agencies)	Migratory[1] Children (State Agency)	State Administraton	PART A TOTAL	PART B Special Incentive Grants	Local Educational Agencies	Adminstration	PART C Total	ADMINISTRATION	TOTAL
GRAND TOTAL	1,446,152,668	85,777,779	15,552,033	5,896,590	2,001,246	78,331,437	18,048,016	1,653,758,769	$17,855,113	$47,239,237	$448,588	$47,687,825	$18,496,604	$1,719,500,000
50 States & D.C	1,396,092,696	85,135,430	17,092,412	5,685,421	2,001,246	78,331,437	17,632,794	1,601,971,436	17,855,113	47,239,237	448,588	47,687,825	18,081,382	1,667,514,374
ALABAMA	34,549,166	633,507	199,129	39,363		711,306	361,325	36,493,796		1,592,071	15,920	1,60[illegible],991	377,245	38,101,78
ALASKA	2,898,078	1,464,514	86,993	—		—	150,000	4,599,585	493,314	65,252		65,252	150,000	5,158,151
ARIZONA	8,221,631	530,238	299,156	11,577		2,104,281	150,000	11,316,883		115,799		115,799	150,000	11,432,682
ARKANSAS	20,963,618	1,201,718	199,592	39,363		751,595	231,559	23,387,445		902,274	9,023	911,297	240,582	24,298,742
CALIFORNIA	121,348,148	2,026,019	1,448,082	177,827		10,076,838	1,350,769	136,427,683	160,932	3,642,812	36,498	3,686,310	1,387,267	140,274,925
COLORADO	10,933,510	0,538,848	157,451	—		1,523,566	150,000	14,303,375	44,160	23[illegible],849		233,749	150,000	14,581,384
CONNECTICUT	14,997,517	1,516,973	105,494	—	49,080	726,612	164,957	16,660,633	313,295	294,264	2,942	297,206	167,899	17,271,134
DELAWARE	2,323,748	676,357	158,130	—		315,216	150,000	3,623,451	44,436	53,793		53,793	150,000	3,721,680
FLORIDA	25,292,847	2,057,972	621,467	582,567		11,147,502	397,024	40,099,379		866,795	668	875,463	405,692	40,974,842
GEORGIA	40,573,812	781,233	485,318	192,645		537,647	425,707	42,996,362		1,686,386	16,863	1,703,249	442,570	44,699,611
HAWAII	4,106,552	251,320	23,624	—	20,608	—	150,000	4,552,104		199,446		199,446	150,000	4,751,550
IDAHO	2,719,220	196,350	59,739	25,007		909,509	150,000	4,059,825		—		—	150,000	4,059,825
ILLINOIS	77,364,803	5,479,386	568,153	—	120,981	724,867	842,582	85,100,772		2,648,053	26,480	2,674,533	869,062	87,775,305
INDIANA	18,773,439	2,144,570	282,485	191,719	179,679	729,830	223,017	22,524,739	125,796	319,909	3,199	323,108	226,216	22,973,436
IOWA	14,601,661	756,184	131,305	—	83,128	101,076	156,734	15,830,088	724,284	103,017	1,030	104,047	157,764	16,658,419
KANSAS	9,631,973	1,102,617	139,853	[illegible]5,209		646,474	150,000	11,756,126		182,840		182,840		11,938,966
KENTUCKY	32,212,788	712,696	—	51,591		88,913	330,760	33,406,748		1,277,759	12,777	1,290,536	343,537	34,697,284
LOUISIANA	31,322,489	2,131,141	439,472	20,819		488,560	344,025	34,746,526	1,000,433	1,258,980	12,590	1,271,570	356,615	37,018,529
MAINE	5,641,269	535,332	129,202	12,503	11,114	64,833	150,000	6,544,253	447,714	90,724		90,724	150,000	7,082,691
MARYLAND	22,681,512	1,260,782	521,388	231,967		950,419	256,461	25,902,529	325,682	806,893	8,069	814,962	264,530	27,043,173
MASSACHUSETTS	28,106,284	3,298,662	152,282	74,970		292,850	319,250	32,244,298		713,303	7,134	720,437	326,384	32,964,736
MICHIGAN	58,912,993	4,873,408	294,814	474,449	14,265	4,329,746	688,997	69,588,672	2,678,267	1,563,104	15,631	1,578,735	704,628	73,845,675
MINNESOTA	20,897,155	678,289	319,131	190,938		450,570	225,361	22,761,444	2,346,017	546,523	5,465	551,988	230,826	25,659,442
MISSISSIPPI	35,922,628	494,580	250,069	43,067		1,040,563	377,509	38,128,416		1,619,283	16,193	1,635,476	393,702	39,763,894
MISSOURI	23,367,302	1,869,958	310,733	106,974		464,942	261,199	26,381,108		775,754	7,758	783,512	268,957	27,164,620
MONTANA	2,865,542	324,626	87,987	—	50,477	872,462	150,000	4,351,094	256,827	19,995		19,995	150,000	4,627,916
NEBRASKA	7,187,530	334,814	88,450	—	16,208	289,431	150,000	8,066,433		162,258		162,258	150,000	8,228,691
NEVADA	1,108,679	130,128	105,121	14,819		38,900	150,000	1,547,647		—		—	150,000	1,547,647

NEW HAMPSHIRE	2,273,895	347,780	84,282	—		24,081	150,000	2,880,038		—		—	150,000	2,880,038
NEW JERSEY	52,903,906	4,240,298	739,831	54,300		2,279,346	602,177	60,819,858	1,277,454	1,738,060	17,380	1,755,440	619,557	63,852,752
NEW MEXICO	7,393,185	382,050	137,075	—		1,016,946	150,000	9,079,256	299,317	241,567		241,567	160,000	9,620,140
NEW YORK	218,024,439	9,996,871	1,771,373	778,015		2,932,220	2,335,029	235,837,947	2,678,267	8,957,577	89,576	9,047,153	2,424,605	247,563,367
NORTH CAROLINA	51,556,663	2,130,014	773,823	375,566		1,545,794	563,909	56,954,769		4,032,152	20,321	2,052,473	584,230	59,007,242
NORTH DAKOTA	4,101,267	294,526	58,812	23,154		762,709	150,000	5,390,468		124,949		124,949	150,000	5,515,417
OHIO	45,280,413	5,154,655	835,414	104,195	131,981	1,516,620	530,233	53,553,511		1,344,446	13,444	4,357,890	543,677	54,911,401
OKLAHOMA	16,649,246	658,977	154,672	204,686	251,458	773,360	186,924	18,879,323		618,586	6,186	624,772	193,110	19,504,095
OREGON	8,709,633	1,316,495	240,633	77,624		1,945,762	150,000	12,440,147	652,371	112,591		112,591	150,000	13,205,109
PENNSYLVANIA	69,645,082	5,775,689	760,365	208,365	244,036	631,411	772,652	78,037,822	630,041	2,244,892	22,449	2,267,341	795,101	80,935,205
RHODE ISLAND	5,012,119	511,454	21,181	13,432	33,064	3,100	150,000	5,764,350		120,749		126,749	150,000	5,891,099
SOUTH CAROLINA	29,853,231	1,214,222	301,472	378,345	88,450	644,158	324,799	32,804,677		1,311,319	13,113	1,324,432	337,912	34,129,109
SOUTH DAKOTA	5,470,551	333,425	51,866	4,631	—	36,510	150,000	6,047,983	101,179	12,932		32,932	150,000	6,182,094
TENNESSEE	31,273,191	878,019	459,385	65,259	238,954	322,311	332,376	33,569,995		1,297,321	12,973	1,310,294	345,349	14,880,289
TEXAS	67,675,754	5,534,851	966,469	207,001	316,754	19,475,887	941,367	95,078,083		2,407,922	24,079	2,432,001	965,446	97,510,084
UTAH	4,462,187	400,110	106,974	7,873		263,961	150,000	5,391,105	198,053	44,548		44,548	150,000	5,634,606
VERMONT	2,092,957	733,535	63,443	4,168		6,483	150,000	3,051,586	366,412	39,070		29,070	150,000	4,447,063
VIRGINIA	31,522,692	1,055,845	549,688	398,257		778,917	343,054	34,648,453		1,018,609	10,186	1,028,795	353,240	35,677,248
WASHINGTON	15,134,977	1,368,534	367,179	98,765		2,095,331	190,647	19,255,383	946,568	267,890	2,679	270,559	193,326	20,172,510
WEST VIRGINIA	17,319,813	470,963	238,491	30,101	25,470	209,317	182,942	18,477,097	65,907	668,461	6,483	654,947	189,426	19,197,951
WISCONSIN	18,709,456	2,155,588	432,661	73,568	43,729	529,894	219,449	22,164,345	1,513,569	347,759	3,478	351,237	222,927	24,069,161
WYOMING	1,186,384	222,033	49,957	—		197,811	150,000	1,806,185	163,917	—		—	150,000	1,970,105
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	11,194,811	948,274	262,746	—	81,810		150,000	12,637,641		543,769		543,709	150,000	14,181,350
BIA	16,688,398							16,686,398						16,638,398
AMERICAN SAMOA	360,065						25,000	385,065					45,000	385,065
GUAM	952,825	70,896					25,000	1,048,721					25,000	1,048,721
PUERTO RICO	30,296,832	571,453	42,714	211,169			315,222	31,837,390					315,222	31,837,390
TRUST TERRITORIES	1,152,995						25,000	1,177,995					25,000	1,177,995
VIRGIN ISLANDS	608,857		15,907				25,000	649,764					25,000	649,764
National Advisory Council on Education of disadvantaged														185,000
Undistributed														13,293

[1] $1,900,000 of this amount reserved for the Migrant Student Record Transfer System.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

	Term of Office
Dean Owen F. Peagler Chairman - New York	1975
Dr. Wilbur H. Lewis Vice Chairman - Ohio	1975
Dr. Alma A. Barba New Mexico	1976
Mrs. Irene C. Cardwell Texas	1975
Dr. Alonzo A. Crim Georgia	1976
Mrs. Camille V. Dabney Illinois	1975
Mr. Frederick D. Felder, Jr. Minnesota	1975
Mrs. Elaine B. Jenkins District of Columbia	1976
Mrs. Rosella E. Lipson California	1977
Mrs. Mary A. McCabe Utah	1977
Mr. Ben Reifel South Dakota	1977
Mrs. Carol L. Schwartz District of Columbia	1977
Mrs. Rosalie G. Silberman Maryland	1976
Mr. Kenneth M. Smith Delaware	1976
Dr. George Willeford Texas	1977

Mrs. Roberta Lovenheim
Executive Director